



PRICE, 15 CENTS.

THE
3
ULSTER LOYALISTS.

A REPLY TO THE
SPEECHES
OF THE
REV. DR. KANE & MR. G. HILL SMITH

DELIVERED IN
Mutual Street Rink, on the 9th September, 1886.

BY BRYAN LYNCH, TORONTO.

TORONTO :
1886.



THE
ULSTER LOYALISTS.

A REPLY TO THE
SPEECHES

OF THE
REV. DR. KANE & MR. G. HILL SMITH

DELIVERED IN
Mutual Street Rink, on the 9th September, 1886.

BY BRYAN LYNCH, TORONTO.

TORONTO :
1886.

ERRATUM.

On page 3, the name "Laxton" should be "Sexton."

PREFACE.

At the last meeting of the Protestant Home Rule Association, which was held in Dublin about two weeks ago, the Rev. Mr. Lunie, a clergyman belonging to the Church of England, said that the Irish Loyalists were perverters of truth, who appealed to the worst passions of the people, while Mr. Swift McPeill characterised their writings and speeches as an avalanche of falsehoods, to which the Reverend Professor Galbraith, of Trinity College, added the additional testimony of a pure and unselfish patriotism by describing them as a great brigade of liars; and this testimony, coming as it does from men who have gained nothing by their advocacy of Home Rule, nor can have nothing particular to expect from its consummation, other than the infusion of life and energy which it is generally expected to produce among all classes and parts of the country, ought to awaken at least some suspicion among the people of Canada as to the sort of gentlemen who are going the rounds of this Province at the present time misrepresenting the principles and actions of the Irish people by falsehoods the most criminal and barefaced that ever was uttered on a political platform in this or any other country. And that this is not only in accordance with the character given them by the reverend and learned gentlemen whom I have already referred to, but is absolutely and incontrovertibly true, will appear manifest to any person who peruses, without prejudice, the following pages, in which will be found not the opinions of "papists" or "agitators," but of men, the latches of whose shoes neither Dr. Kane nor Mr. Smith would be worthy to loose, unless we except Lord Clare and Mr. Spring Rice, who, if they had lived to the present, would no doubt prove themselves congenial spirits and worthy companions of Messrs. Kane and Smith, and would doubtless congratulate Mr. William Megaw, corn merchant of Dublin, the great loyalist, on the successful way he played his cards while he was cheating many of Her Majesty's loyal subjects to the tune of £40,000. Although it is not long since he was denouncing Mr. Parnell as a "strolling robber" who should be imprisoned or banished from the country. Whether he has failed with a full

pocket or not, he cannot be supposed ignorant of his financial condition, and it forms such an interesting spectacle for "Gods and men" to see a moralist and loyalist of the deepest dye showing his great love for his countrymen, in a manner that is peculiar to these *religious politicians*, that I considered it deserved a space in this or any other production on the Loyal minority in Ireland, and it remains to be seen whether Mr. Egan, who is also an extensive corn merchant in Lincoln, Nebraska, who, according to Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith's opinion, is such a notorious robber that it would only be in accordance with their description of him if he was to follow the example of his commercial brother in Dublin.

I may also state, before closing, that it was my original intention to have published in this pamphlet a full report of the speeches of Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith, as they appeared in the *Mail*, in order that those who were disposed to judge of the question from the amount of evidence produced on each side should have an opportunity of doing so, but on calling on Mr. Clark, editor of the *Orange Sentinel*, with that object in view, I found that the type was distributed before I had arrived, and Mr. Clark, I am glad to acknowledge, was evidently more disappointed at not being able to oblige me than I was myself, offering at the same time to give me a stereotype of all or any of the other speeches they might make while in Canada free of charge, an offer which, though I had to decline it, I beg to return my sincere thanks, and hope that the day will not be far distant when Irishmen who can be so kind and accommodating, while differing so widely as we do, will be brought into closer harmony and friendship by the removal of those barriers that are at present so prejudicial to our mutual interest.

BRYAN LYNCH.

288 King Street East,
TORONTO, 30th September, 1886.

financial con-
r " Gods and
showing his
aliar to these
space in this
eland, and it
extensive corn
Kane and Mr.
uld only be in
to follow the

iginal intention
ne speeches of
Mail, in order
tion from the
ave an oppor-
of the *Orange*
type was dis-
ad to acknow-
able to oblige
ve me a stereo-
make while in
to decline it, I
ay will not be
ecommodating,
nto closer har-
ers that are at

LYNCH.

THE

IRISH QUESTION.

IT is not a very complimentary announcement, nor a matter for much congratulation, to be informed that the people on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, notwithstanding their extraordinary enterprise and energy, know little or nothing of the affairs of a country whose unhappy condition has been the subject of common conversation on the streets of every city in the world during the past quarter of a century; and that the members of the Loyal and Patriotic Union of Ireland, with that great solicitude which is so characteristic of it for the enlightenment, the honor, the mental and spiritual welfare and temporal prosperity of every one (except themselves), should in the generosity of their magnanimous nature, send out two distinguished individuals to enlighten the heathens of this country, with a true and unvarnished tale of the whole Irish Question, in order that the people might be able to appreciate the unparalleled sacrifices which they have made in the past, for their Queen and country, and induce all their admirers to show their practical appreciation by contributing largely to the fund for the defence and preservation of the angelic landlords in Ireland.

But before I proceed to point out a few historical facts, with a view of throwing some additional light upon their undying love of Queen and country, which seems to consume the affectionate nature of our northern friends, I might be permitted to ask them a few questions that, no doubt, will prove a pleasant and agreeable duty for them to answer. In the first place they might inform us why they did not come out here a little sooner when the whole press of Great Britain and Ireland seemed to have been in league with one another to blacken the Irish character, when even the 20, 25, 40, and 50 per cent. reductions in rents that were forced upon the landlords, were reported here as voluntary reductions; and the landlords described in the most eulogistic and glowing terms for their great generosity, and practical sympathy with the tenants in making such liberal reductions, notwithstanding that they had been compelled by the judges in the land courts, who in giving judgment in the tenants' favor, as they invariably did,

expressed their astonishment and indignation, that landlords could be so heartless as to take advantage of the unresisting tenants, to an extent which they very justly characterized as wholesale robbery. Why did they not come over here when the landlords' agents seemed to have command of the telegraph wires, by the harrowing descriptions they gave of the movements of a few bands of moonlighters, while they were almost silent on the desolating operations of the crowbar brigade; pulling the houses down on the people that built them, leaving them on the roadside to perish with cold and hunger, and warning the neighbors from assisting them on pain of eviction, thus destroying at one blow their own means of living, stopping up the flow of practical sympathy which has always been the national characteristic of the Irish people, who are ever ready to relieve those suddenly reduced to objects of charity by their unmerited distress? But now that they have come to enlighten the people of this benighted continent, why did they pass Quebec and Montreal, without making some effort to inform them as to who are the real friends of Ireland, and who are the knaves; the fact that the Lower Province is supposed to be more in need of information than Ontario, and that Messrs. Kane and Smith have not thought it their duty to supply it, gives rise at once to a suspicion that they are not such ardent Irishmen, or soldiers of the cross and the Queen as they would have us believe. But after being assured that the delegates do not come here as Orangemen nor politicians but as the representatives of all creeds and classes, to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," all our sceptical misgivings might have been set aside, if we had been as oblivious of Irish affairs as they would no doubt wish to find us. If, however, Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith wish to make the people of this country believe that they are not Orangemen, first, last, and all the time, they must take the Canadians for greater simpletons than they are likely to find them. Sir John Macdonald, in attending the Methodist Conference, might as well say that he was there as a fellow missionary, not as a politician. The people no doubt would believe him in order to oblige him. There is, however, one thing upon which there seems to be no doubt, that Dr. Kane came here under the name and guise of a minister of the gospel, and as such it is his duty, if not for his own sake, for that of the ministry to which he belongs, not only to tell the truth but to avoid even the appearance of evil, by rendering unto every man that which is his due. What then can be thought of the Christian purity and veracity of a preacher of the gospel who will go out of his way to belie and abuse men who have never done him any injury, or at all events no injustice? And if I succeed in showing that

MR. PATRICK EGAN.

is not the notorious robber or swindler which Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith

ds could be so
 n extent which
 did they not
 e command of
 e of the move-
 almost silent
 ing the houses
 dside to perish
 sisting them on
 means of living,
 ways been the
 eady to relieve
 unmerited dis-
 people of this
 ontreal, without
 ends of Ireland,
 s supposed to be
 Kane and Smith
 e to a suspicion
 e cross and the
 assured that the
 but as the repre-
 whole truth, and
 t have been set
 would no doubt
 to make the peo-
 , last, and all the
 s than they are
 the Methodist
 missionary, not
 n order to oblige
 seems to be no
 of a minister of
 sake, for that of
 th but to avoid
 that which is his
 d veracity of a
 e and abuse men
 injustice? And

have represented him to be, and that the Land or National League is not the
 persecuting and unrelenting organization that they have described it ; I think
 that if I accomplish nothing else I shall have done sufficient to divest all
 their other assertions of whatever importance they might unsuspectingly re-
 ceive. On November 2, 1880, an information was filed at the suit of the
 Right Hon. Hugh Law, then Attorney-General, against Mr. Parnell, Mr. T.
 D. Sullivan, Mr. Lexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Patrick Egan, Treasurer
 of the Land League, and Mr. Brennan, Secretary ; Mr. Egan having several
 thousand pounds of Land League funds was advised by Mr. Parnell and
 the other members of the League to make all haste to Paris before he
 could be arrested, and thus disappoint the Government officials, who had
 evidently made up their minds to confiscate all the money they could lay
 their hands on. Mr. Egan succeeded in getting to Paris, and continued to
 receive subscriptions towards the League from all parts of the world, the
 same as when he was in Dublin, and sent cheques on the various banks
 for the prosecution of the cause in Ireland, with as much regularity as if he
 had been in the Irish capital, notwithstanding the almost universal clamor
 that was then got up denouncing Mr. Egan as a fraud and absconder, in
 order that they might make the American people believe it, and thus put a
 stop to the continual flow of American money. But it was all to no pur-
 pose ; the people saw through the trap that was set for them, and they
 redoubled their efforts by increased contributions to the fund, so that what
 was intended by the Loyalists as a fatal blow to the Irish cause through the
 persecution of the Land League, only placed it in a much more powerful
 and consequently independent position. Let me ask, then, if any reason-
 able man, or any person who does not desire to be a candidate for a ward
 in any of our lunatic asylums, or the occupant of a cell in one of her
 Majesty's prisons, could have forgot himself so far as to charge a man with
 robbery, and denounce him as an absconder for doing that which his col-
 leagues suggested and advised, and which under the circumstances was the
 only thing he could possibly do to preserve the property of the organization
 and keep the sinews of war from flowing into the hands of the Government
 whom they very justly regarded as their natural and unrelenting enemies.
 But in order that those who attended the meeting at the Mutual Street Rink
 or who read a report of their speeches in the newspapers, may form a just
 estimate of the candor and the honorable motives that seem to actuate
 Messrs. Kane and Smith, in their burning zeal for Ireland, and eternal love
 for Her Majesty the Queen, I will supply a little more information as to
 Mr. Egan's position, which these ultra-loyal gentlemen cannot but be in
 possession of, as they are assiduous observers of all our leader's movements,
 but which they completely ignored, notwithstanding their declaration to
 "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," lest they should

and Mr. Smith

meet with such a reception as the tyrannical nature of their cause deserves. Mr. Kane informed his hearers in the rink that Mr. Patrick Egan was presented with a silver service at the Chicago Convention—paid for out of the parliamentary fund—the contributions “forced from poor servant girls.” Well, admitting that the two thousand pounds which the presentation cost had been taken from that source, it was with money received from the same class of persons that Dr. Kane says Mr. Egan absconded with a few years ago.

Then it must follow as a natural and logical consequence, either that the assertion of this loyal and angelic gentleman, that Mr. Egan robbed the Irish people of money subscribed for the cause from all parts of the world, or the Irish people, and especially Messrs. Parnell, Davitt & Co., are the greatest fools in creation, and as the Irish leaders have outwitted all their enemies and pretended friends since they took the helm of the Irish ship, in its stormy voyage, and have gained the confidence and affection of the Irish people all over the world, through the disinterested and fearless manner in which they have guided the ship on its successful voyage. The presumption is, if there could be any doubt about the matter, that the Irish people are not the fools, nor is Mr. Egan the rogue that the Loyal delegates have painted him, for nothing is more remarkable than the effective way that those who have betrayed the cause, or in any way intentionally injured it while they pretended to be its friend, have been treated by the Irish people. They are willing to forgive and forget personal grievances and wrongs, but, let any person use his position to advance his personal interest, at the expense of the national welfare, whether he be Priest or Bishop or Member of Parliament, so long as he lives he may rely upon it he is politically or ecclesiastically dead, as far as the Irish people are concerned. But Mr. Kane is very anxious among others to know what Mr. Egan does for a living; probably it may be gratifying to him and his numerous clerical Orange friends to know that Mr. Egan, and as a further proof that he is not depending on the National League for a living, and is not the sordid individual that the loyalists have represented him to be. Allow me to illuminate if possible the dark and contradicted understanding of these distinguished libellers by other statements in further refutation of this groundless and criminal charge. Mr. Egan has been President of the Irish National League for the past two years. According to the rules of that organization his yearly salary was three thousand dollars. When he found that the Executive of the League would not accept of his services without recompense, Mr. Egan on each occasion on which the Treasurer, the Rev. Dr. O’Riley, paid him the salary allowed, wrote out a cheque for the amount, as his contribution towards the parliamentary fund, so that in two years he has subscribed six thousand dollars to defeat the Irish landlords whose hopeless and foredoomed cause Dr. Kane and his friends are vainly

cause deserves.
Egan was pre-
for out of the
servant girls.'
presentation cost
from the same
with a few years

nce, either that
Egan robbed the
ts of the world,
& Co., are the
twitted all their
the Irish ship,
affection of the
fearless manner
e. The presump-
the Irish people
al delegates have
fective way that
onally injured it
the Irish people.
and wrongs, but,
interest, at the
ishop or Member
e is politically or
erned. But Mr.
Egan does for a
numerous clerical
proof that he is
s not the sordid

Allow me to
standing of these
refutation of this
sident of the Irish
the rules of that
When he found
s services without
reasurer, the Rev.
a cheque for the
fund, so that in
the Irish landlords
friends are vainly

trying to sustain. I wonder if Dr. Kane can give another instance of any other robber, and abscorder, of several thousands, giving three thousand dollars a year towards the institution that he robbed or deceived, and the victims of his knavery honoring him with a public address, and two thousand pounds' worth of silver service. I wonder if Dr. Kane has given two years' salary towards the cause which he professes to have at heart. I wonder if Mr. Smith has given anything out of his *large and increasing practise* at the Bar for the honor of his Queen and the preservation of his country and the Protestant religion that has shed such a flood of light and gentleness in Ireland as it is exemplified in Belfast, or how much either of them have suffered by the advocacy of a policy of love and gentleness for those wolves who are always watching to snatch the sheep as well as the lambs from the door. These are questions which it would be well for those who cheered such sweeping assertions and criminal charges to reflect on, or consider. But these "Apostles of peace and gentleness" are not contented with making false charges against the ex-Treasurer and ex-President of the League, but they go on in their mission of slander by enquiring who

MR. MICHAEL DAVITT

is, and what he does for a living, as well as others who are identified with the national cause. And so great seems to be their thirst for vengeance upon the heads of anyone who has contributed to expose the villainous system of oppression, which the landlords and the Orangemen, of whom Dr. Kane seems to be the worthy leader, and to place the Irish people so that the landlords can no longer confiscate their property, nor drive them to desperation by exacting rents which the land cannot pay, so determined are they to effect the ruin if possible of men whom they find have a deserved place in the affections of the Irish people, that in their zeal they seem to forget themselves, unless we are to suppose that they were instructed in their brief when leaving Paradise Grove in the North of Ireland, to emulate the example of that class of distinguished moralists whom Lord Byron had in view when he wrote

"A man must serve his time to every trade,
Save censure, critics all are ready made.
Take hackneyed jokes from Miller, got by rote,
With just enough of learning to misquote;
A mind well skilled to *forge* or find fault,
A turn for punning, call it *attic* salt;
'To Jeffrey,' (or the Loyal Minority) 'go,' be silent and discreet.
Their pay is just ten sterling pounds (per hour) or per sheet:
Fear not to lie; 'twill seem a lucky hit,
Shrink not from *blasphemy*, 'twill pass for wit,
Care not for feeling, pass your proper jest,
And stand a critic hated, yet caressed."

Such seems to be the honorable vocation which the Rev. Dr. and Mr. Smith have marked out for themselves, if we may judge from the frequency with which they reminded their audience of the fact that Michael Davitt and some others of the popular leaders are ex-convicts, and enquire with a hypocritical air what these men do for a living. But all these efforts after effect are only so much wasted energy, as Mr. Davitt is increasing in popularity everywhere he goes, and when he comes to Toronto, as we expect him soon, there will be hundreds ready to pay down their dollars to hear or see him, who have no particular sympathy with the Irish struggle, but who are always willing to recognize merit and integrity when they find it, although they might not care to spend ten cents on Dr. Kane or his companion, notwithstanding the exalted position which they think they occupy, for a man who can gather from ten to twenty thousand people in any part of the world where he is announced to speak, who can sit in the speaker's gallery in the House of Commons, with Cardinal Manning on the one side of him and the Prince of Wales on the other, in the presence of all the leading men and women of Great Britain and Ireland, need have no fear of any serious consequence following the denunciation of one who has wasted his time and opportunities, in traducing the character of those who have proven by their actions the friends of their country, and we may therefore pass from these personal slanders to the main question upon which it would have been well if our friends had confined themselves. For in a Democratic country like Canada, it ought to be regarded as an honorable distinction to the men or the country to which they belong, to think that after they had been evicted and sent as outcasts in the land of their birth, they have by their own unaided efforts become the leaders and benefactors of the people, whose miseries they can understand and sympathize with, as they suffered similar privations themselves. I have thought it best, whether wisely or not, to deal with the personal abuse at the outset, not because I consider it more serious than the misrepresentations on the more important questions, as to whether the Orangemen, or the Loyal Minority, as they call themselves, are the loyal and peaceable subjects they perpetually represent themselves to be; whether the National League or the Nationalists are as bad as they are usually painted; whether or not the country has prospered so much since the union, as our loyal instructors assured us the other night; whether or not it is separation that the Irish people desire, and if so, where is the great crime attached to such a demand, assuming it to be true.

SAMPLES OF ORANGE LOYALTY.

Now we have been so persistently assured that the Orangemen, for that is the proper name of the Loyal Minority, and I propose to call them by their right name in future, no matter how disagreeable it may be, we

hear so much about their undying love for the person who may by chance fill the throne, and the great love of country, justice and religious liberty, that it ought to awaken some little suspicion in the minds of most people, for if they were so very loyal and magnanimous in their dealing with their fellowmen, there would be no necessity for shouting so much about it on the housestops, like the hypocrite who is always turning the white of his eyes to heaven, saying "Behold how religious I am." We are generally a little suspicious of the motives of these gentlemen, and when enquiry is made, it invariably happens that these long-faced gentry are not more virtuous nor religious than their neighbors, and so in like manner it will be found in the brief enquiry which I propose to make into the history and conduct of the Protestant, that is the ultra-Protestant party in Ireland, it will be found that their loyalty may be measured by the amount of personal advantage they enjoy, or expect to derive from it. It is always a safe rule not to be too demonstrative in one's loyalty, and from what I propose to give of the Orangemen's conduct in the past, as well as the present, it will appear that "discretion on their part would have been the better part of valor."

If, therefore, Mr. Smith will pardon me for presuming to profit by his example, though not like him a "barrister of *large and increasing practice*," I, too, will call witnesses into the box, to testify as to the character of the Orange minority, and though they are not so distinguished as the witness with whom he took such liberties in the Mutual Street Rink, namely Mr. Gladstone, they are nevertheless men in whom he ought to have more confidence as they cannot be suspected of any partiality for the National party, as the mere mention of their names will sufficiently prove. The first witness I will call is

SIR GEORGE CORNWALL LEWIS,

and when it is stated that while he was High Sheriff for the County of Limerick, at a time when no Catholic could aspire to any such position, Sir George had to perform the disagreeable duty of his office under the White-boy Act, that of flogging a victim at the tail of a cart through the streets of Limerick, because the Government and their laws were so odious, and detested by the people, that no person could be found to do the dirty work of the Government, notwithstanding the large award that was offered by the sheriff to any person who would relieve him of the duties of his office. On page 33 of Sir G. Lewis' work on "local disturbances in Ireland," will be found a description of an insurrection among the Protestants of the North of Ireland against what must even now be regarded as a very trivial grievance when compared with the more serious acts of injustice with which their southern countrymen had to contend. "It seems," says Sir George, "that the dis-

tribution of labor which each housekeeper was bound to contribute to the repair of roads was abused by the landowners ; that the rich had been exempted, and the work done had been bestowed on roads more beneficial to individuals than the public." This, together with a demand for a reduction in the tithes payable to their own clergy, and the regulation in the price of land, though grievances that ought to be redressed, were not of such magnitude as to justify "the general system of insult, the erection of gallows, the menacing of perdition to all their enemies," on the part of a body of men who were always boasting of their loyalty to the laws of the country, as they do now, and who had the detested papists, as they called them, so thoroughly under their feet. In Gordon's History of Ireland will be found a description of a rising eight years after the rising of the Hearts of Oak Boys, to whom I have already referred, and although the cause of the disturbance was local, yet, as Mr. Gordon says, it was really more bloody and of longer duration than that of the Hearts of Oak. On an estate in the county of Antrim, a part of the vast possessions of an absentee landlord, the Marquis of Donegal, it was proposed when its leases had expired to let it only to those who could pay large fines ; and the agent was said to have exacted extravagant fees on his own account also ! The result was that those tenants who were not able to pay the increased rents, nor the fines demanded had their places taken over their head, and rendered thus destitute, they maimed the cattle of those who had taken their lands, committed other outrages, and to express a firmness of resolution called themselves Hearts of Steel. They marched in thousands to Belfast to rescue one of their friends who was confined upon a "charge of felony," demanding the prisoner from the military guard, "the officers of which were fortunately persuaded by a respectable physician to his liberation, to prevent the ruinous consequences of a desperate battle." So great and wide was the discontent that many thousand Protestants emigrated from all parts of Ulster to the American settlements, where they soon appeared in arms against the American rebels, oh no, but against the British Government, "and contributed powerfully by their zeal and valor to the separation of the American Colonies from the Empire of Great Britain."

Lovers of the British Empire ; of a United Empire, who take such questionable pride in the achievements of the past, and profess themselves ready to lay down the lives for the preservation of that empire, no matter how antiquated the laws, or how partial their enforcement, who are prepared to lick the toes of Royalty, providing she will only condescend to smile on them, what do you think of the conduct of your ancestors in breaking up the British Empire, in order to lay the foundation of a larger and probably more lasting one than that which they left ? But let us hasten to another exhibition of Protestant loyalty as it is practised

bute to the
 l been ex-
 e beneficial
 and for a
 e regulation
 redressed,
 n of insult,
 ir enemies,"
 ng of their
 ho had the
 ir feet. In
 rising eight
 have already
 yet, as Mr.
 than that of
 art of the vast
 was proposed
 y large fines ;
 own account
 pay the in-
 over their
 of those who
 ss a firmness
 in thousands
 n a "charge
 the officers of
 to his libera-
 e." So great
 ts emigrated
 re they soon
 st the British
 valor to the
 Britain."
 e, who take
 and profess
 ation of that
 their enforce-
 she will only
 duct of your
 he foundation
 ey left ? But
 t is practised

in Ulster. "About the year 1785 the North was again disquieted," says Sir G. Lewis, and here I would call attention to the emphasis that he places on the words "North was again disquieted," not the South but the "North," "by tumults arising from religious and political animosity, and not from any local grievances. The Protestant party began," observe that again the Protestant, or let me say the Orange, the Loyal party, "began by visiting the houses of Catholics in order to search for arms, and from the time when these visits were made," that is before sunrise "they derived their name of Peep or Break-of-Day Boys. They did not, however, confine themselves to the searching for arms, but attacked the houses and the Chapels of the Catholics, sometimes burning the buildings and sometimes destroying all the furniture and property contained therein." Just what they have been doing recently in Belfast, and which has roused their ire at the police, because they did not allow them to show their love of Queen and country as extensively as they would like. At length the Peep-of-Day Boys, getting ashamed of their name from the "brutal outrages" with which it was associated, changed their name in 1795 or soon afterwards to that of Orange Boys or Orange Men, the same as the Orangemen are changing into the new and more respectable appellation of Loyal Minority or Loyalists, and by-and-by when the history of the Belfast riots comes to be written they will be exercising their ingenuity to discover another more genteel and delicate expression, that will throw dust in the eyes of the public, until time and their own evil propensities, necessitate some other, and it is to be hoped, a more radical and lasting one. But rebellions and murders in the North seem in former days as they are now, to have been the order of the day, and what would be the astonishment of some of our union friends, if they only knew that the rebellion of 1798, which is generally believed to have been started and carried on by the United Irishmen, originated in a very different and unexpected source.

"This rebellion," says Sir G. Lewis, "*as is well known*, was originally organized by Presbyterians in Belfast, and sprang from a sympathy with the French Revolution, the object of its original promoters being to make Ireland, with the assistance of France, an Independent Republic. When it spread to the southeastern counties, being an insurrection of the rest of the community against the governing classes, it necessarily assumed the character of a war of Catholics against Protestants, which alarmed the Presbyterians of the north, and deterred them from further participation in the rebellion of which they themselves had been the originators." Thus we see that at a time when the Protestants, the Loyal Minority, as they would have us call them, had everything their own way. When by a series of confiscations as barbarous as they were universal and unrelenting, when the Protestants had all the land. When they had all the representations in Parliament to

themselves. When they filled the corporations with the representatives of their peculiar contracted and liberal views. When they had all the schools and colleges to themselves. When they had the whole practice of the Bar and the honors of the Bench. When they had the medical profession. When they had all the trade and fishing on the coasts to themselves. When they had all the mercantile and manufacturing industries of the country in their own hands. When the Catholics were not allowed to keep property of any description above the value of five pounds. When the Catholics were not allowed to accept of a deed of any description, nor to marry a Protestant with property or without it. When they were not allowed to practice at the Bar, much less aspire to the Bench of their country. When they were not admitted to study or practice medicine. When they were prohibited from voting for a member of Parliament, much less acting as such. When they were not allowed to learn the blacksmithing and several other of the ordinary trades. When, in short, they were not allowed to give their children any sort of education, either at home or abroad, on pain of banishment, and when as Burk very justly observed, the laws were so constructed as not to suppose it possible for any Catholics to remain in the country, even then you will see by the extracts I have given that the Loyal Minority were not contented with monopolizing all the good things of the earth, but were eternally attacking their neighbor, fomenting rebellion in the country, with as much persistency as if the Almighty had sent them some divine oracle to go and make Ireland a second Canaan for themselves. What a contrast between the conduct of these modern pirates, and that of the Catholics at this time as described by one, who, though a Loyalist, seems to have more regard for truth and justice than the gentlemen who are now on a tour of instruction. "But in the midst of these imaginations they, the Catholics," says

MR. O'DRISCOL,

"they never put off in their allegiance to the throne, and their leaders found it necessary to amuse them with a show of respect for kingly authority. This, too, was according to the usual process of whiteboyism, which in all its violence never was used to contemplate more than a redress of real and almost intolerable oppressions. Upon this occasion, stretching itself far as it did beyond its accustomed range, surrounded by tribulations, and irritated with the difficulties and the hazards of its enterprise, yet it failed not to respect the throne of the monarch."* It may however be contended that this has reference to the conduct of the Orangemen, or Loyal Minority in a by-gone age, and that it is not fair to visit the sins of past generations upon the present. This contention would be both plausible and reasonable, if the opponents of Home Rule were not

* Vol. II., page 205.

eternally raking up pages of antiquated history, and even going to Rome in order to try and father the crimes of the Italian Inquisition on the Irish Catholics or Nationalists, because through all persecutions they have adhered to the religion of their fathers.

As it is desirable to oblige the opponents of Home Rule as much as possible, we will now come down to a period within the recollection of the present generation, when it will be found that the Loyalists of to-day have and continue to prove themselves worthy sons of their beloved sires. In a recent issue of the *Pall Mall Gazette* the Belfast Riots of 1864 and 1872, so moderate and yet so decisive in tone, and coming from an English journal that cannot be suspected of any particular partiality for Ireland, other than what they may feel to be their duty as journalists, do on behalf of the public interest, that I think I will be excused if I give the article in their own words:

THE BELFAST RIOTS OF '64 AND '72.

(From the *Pall Mall Gazette*.)

As so many references have been made to the Belfast riots of 1864 and 1872 during the last few days, it may not be amiss to turn back to the records of those two years. How were the passions of 1864 and 1872 stirred up? By projected surrenders to Separatists? No more than the riots of 1886. One is at once struck by the fact that in all three cases the initiative has been taken by the Orange mob. In 1886 the disturbances began with an attack upon a handful of Catholic navvies by a large and powerful body of Protestant shipbuilders. In 1872 the Orangemen attacked a procession of Catholics on their way home from a meeting. In 1864 they had their origin in the ceremonial of inaugurating a monument to O'Connell in Dublin. This ceremony, in which over 50,000 people took part, passed off in Dublin with remarkable quiet. No one ever thought of a disturbance; there never was any fear of riot: in the evening they even had a great banquet, and the people went quietly to bed. That was in Dublin. But the zealous Protestant rioters away in Belfast could not rest. It was iron to their souls to hear of this peaceful and rather dull demonstration to the memory of the great Irish patriot pass into history as successful. No. The Belfast Protestant had his riotous character to sustain, and his bitter sectarian prejudices to satisfy, so while the Catholics in Dublin were feasting, the Protestants in Belfast were preparing to burn the effigy of O'Connell. "Let us have a counter-demonstration," they said to each other. Hence all the mischief and bloodshed that ensued. Listen to the account of what followed:—

HOW THEY BURNED O'CONNELL.

The protest which they determined on took a shape which could not fail to be highly offensive to the feelings of the Roman Catholic party. The

effigy of O'Connell was constructed, with hands in begging attitude, and a large wallet by its side, to represent the love of the illustrious deceased for the "rent" of the peasantry. With this several thousands of the mill-workers, with fifes and drums, paraded the town, and in the evening the figure was set on fire, with cheers and laughter. To this foolish demonstration all the ensuing troubles may be attributed. The Protestants who had burned O'Connell in effigy were, it seems, especially pleased to hear they had caused so great a commotion among their enemies, and having burned him they determined to bury him. A real coffin was bought, the ashes of the image were placed in it, large numbers of the mill-workers assembled and formed in procession, with fifes and drums in front, playing a Dead March varied with lively airs, followed by the empty coffin, on which five blue lights or Roman candles were burning, and in the rear a dense mass of mill-workers — boys and girls in their working costume just as they had left work, the girls with bare heads, loose jackets, short petticoats, and for the most part unshod. The coffin was borne to the Friar's Bush Burying-ground, a distance of about a mile and a half, but admittance was refused. The coffin was then carried in mock solemnity to the Boyne Bridge again, where it was burned, and the embers thrown into the Blackstaff.

THE DOCTOR'S BILL.

What measures were taken? Much the same as have been taken now. The public-houses were closed from 6 p.m. in the evening to 10 a.m. in the morning. Empty houses were hired in the disturbed districts and turned into barracks. The bloodthirsty character of the rioting may be seen by the house surgeon's report of one week's duties:—"I beg to report," he says, that "there were admitted to hospital 75 patients, of whom 66 were suffering from severe injuries. Upwards of 50 of these cases were the result of the riots, 30 of them being gunshot wounds and the remainder contusions, lacerations and fractures."

A CITY OF RUINS.

It will be long (writes the chronicler) before the traces of the devastation caused by this deplorable conflict disappear from the town, many parts of which presented the appearance of having been sacked by a horde of bandits. In some places heaps of ruins marked the spots where houses stood a few days before; in other places whole lines of houses, windowless, doorless, their fronts battered by paving-stones, stood empty, having been rifled of everything they contained. In those quarters the roadways were strewn with the debris of furniture shattered to pieces and in some cases burnt.

THE RIOTS OF 1872.

The riots of 1872 were begun (as we have said) by an unwarrantable attack upon a peaceful Catholic procession by an infuriated Orange mob.

Here is the account given by the "Annual Register":—A series of savage and bloodthirsty conflicts between the Orange and Roman Catholic faction mobs in the town of Belfast commenced on the anniversary of the 15th August (Thursday), and continued day after day till the ensuing Wednesday, in spite of the efforts of 4,000 soldiers and armed police, who were obliged more than once to charge the rioters with the bayonet, or even to fire upon them. There was some fierce fighting, in which not only stones were thrown but pistols were used, and several persons were wounded. In the evening of the next day the two parties met for a pitched battle, to the number of several thousands, in the brickfield between the Shankhill and Falls roads. The police tried in vain to separate them, and the military were sent for; sixty men of the 4th (Royal) Dragoons and a detachment of the 78th Highlanders forced the combatant mobs apart; but showers of stones were thrown over the heads of the line of soldiery, and fierce howls of mutual execration were exchanged by the hostile bands of Irishmen who were prevented from slaughtering each other."

MORE SHOOTING.

On Saturday and Sunday there were frequently skirmishes in different parts of the town with bludgeons, stones, and firearms; but the Monday's riot was much worse. It began early in the day and great mischief was done. About four o'clock in the afternoon, in the Shankhill road, nearly 5,000 men, women, and boys were assembled, cheering, and shouting, and cursing the Pope. Shots were fired all round by way of signals, and the men dug up the stones of the pavement, while the women and children piled them in small heaps ready for offensive use. The Roman Catholic party did not come forward, as was apparently expected, for another battle, and the Orangemen expended their fury in an attack on the public-houses and shops kept by persons of that religion. The windows were presently smashed, the doors burst open, and the premises sacked. Barrels of wine, spirits, and beer, with hundreds of bottles, were brought out into the open street, and the liquor was speedily drunk, adding fearfully to the prevailing madness. The police endeavored in vain to disperse the mob, and, having charged with fixed bayonets, were repulsed and forced to retreat a short distance. They then turned and fired, when two of the rioters were shot, and one soon died of his wound. The soldiers—Dragoons and Highlanders as before—arrived and took possession of the ground.

It is one of the disadvantages, or the misfortunes, of a weak and desperate cause, that even the very gods seem to conspire against it. Turn where you will you see some traces of its baneful influence, or hear the voices either of the sluggard or the philosopher, and as no evidence can be so crushing and effective as that of their own friends, nothing can be

more just and reasonable than to call in the testimony of an impartial observer, I think that at this stage of our investigation we may be permitted to call a very distinguished gentleman into court, one who has, at least, the courage of his convictions, and is prepared to second any verbal declarations he may make by an appeal to his banker, as was exemplified in the Temperance Hall, at the former Loyalist meeting, when he gave a check for \$500 to the chairman as his contribution to the fund for the preservation of landlordism and serfdom in Ireland, and which sum, with all the burning zeal for the preservation of the Throne, the Protestant religion, and the connection with Great Britain, has not been doubted, so far, for they have only forwarded \$800 to Ireland as a result of their loyalty. And let Mr. Smith, who made the false, but evidently triumphant assertion, that Ireland, which had subscribed largely for the Parnell and Sexton Fund, could only subscribe £180 towards the expenses of sending its members to Parliament, measure the loyalty of the Canadian Orangemen by the amount of money which they have subscribed, in a young and prosperous country, where they claim, as they do in Ulster, that all the wealth and intelligence is on their side; where there is no calls to provide for evicted neighbors, no calls for testimonials, unless to Government officials or cabinet ministers, in which, of course, they are only giving a nail to receive a mile. Yet amidst all this flourish of trumpets and declarations of undying loyalty, and their readiness to lay down their lives for the Throne and country, and to go 200,000 strong to the North of Ireland, if it were necessary, they have only subscribed \$800 since last spring, \$500 of which was given on the platform by Dr. Goldwin Smith, to help in conducting the landlords' campaign through the late general election.

DR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S OPINION.

It ought, therefore, to be a source of comfort and consolation to the Loyalists of Toronto to see what the President of the Toronto branch of the local and Patriotic Union has to say about the rank and file of the army which has brought so much disgrace on the name and memory of a liberal and magnanimous prince in the person of William the Third. In an article in the *Canadian Monthly*, for August, 1875, Professor Goldwin Smith takes the liberty of giving the Orangemen some wholesome advice, and as he has been a somewhat active and bitter opponent of Home Rule, notwithstanding his well-known advocacy of the annexation of Canada with the United States, I will give the Loyal Minority the article word for word as it is published in the *Review*, and I do so with the more pleasure as he is acknowledged one of the most polished writers of the English language at the present time. Messrs. Kane, Smith, Wild and Potts are heartily welcome to all the consolation they can derive from it:—

The anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne seems to have passed off with almost uniform tranquility. Canada and Ireland passed through the trial unscathed, and even the New York Orangemen enjoyed their picnic without molestation. Almost the only exception was a very cowardly and unprovoked attack upon a few Orangemen and their friends at Lawrence, Mass. There was no possible pretext for this assault. That a crowd of angry Roman Catholics should assault a handful of unoffending men and women returning, without band or party insignia, from a picnic, was utterly without excuse—it was simply villainous. At the same time, the question remains, How has it come about that twelfth of July celebrations are the only form of *quasi*-festivity which uniformly excites bad blood, and not unfrequently ends in riot and murder? Is there any countervailing utility traceable in the history and aims of the Society which takes this anniversary under its especial patronage, to set off against the imminent danger which menaces the public peace at least once every year? If any such advantage can be fairly shown to be derivable from fantastic dress and offensive party music, it might be as well if those who plead the cause of the Society would make it known, at least to Protestants who have not been favored with the peculiar light of Ulster tradition.

The conclusion to which many of us have arrived, after some reflection upon the facts of its history, and its somewhat erratic course in this country, is that the Orange Society is not merely valueless in itself, but absolutely harmful as a nucleus for strifes and bitternesses which are foreign both to Canadian feeling and inclination. It may be readily admitted that there are many good and earnest men who are, from hereditary or traditional habit, within the Orange ranks; indeed, unless some such leaven existed, the entire organization would long since have gone to pieces. But that even these *franc-tireurs* of the Church militant should fancy themselves to be the main body of the army, and boldly proclaim that the cause of Protestantism would be lost irretrievably from the moment they ceased to fire their pop-guns or hold their own in street scrimmages with irate Roman Catholics, is surely a marvel of infatuation. 'It has been well remarked that there are two descriptions of Orangemen within the fold of the Society—the ideal Orangeman of the Constitution and the Obligation, who is, in great part, a creature of the imagination; and the practical Orangeman who constitutes the active spirit of the party, ready for any violence, from depopulating a Province or plotting against an Empire, to well-nigh killing a poor Italian organ-grinder for playing so harmless a national tune as "St. Patrick's Day." Of course we are speaking here, not of the majority of the Society, but of those who, in fact, shape its destinies and bring disgrace upon its name. The evils these violent partisans of Orangeism have entailed upon it, and upon the countries where it un-

fortunately flourishes, are melancholy but incontrovertible historical facts. The institution, as it now exists, supplanted the "Peep-o'-Day Boys," and its first lodge was instituted at Loughall in 1795. It proposed no less a task to itself than the forcible ejection of the Roman Catholic population from Ulster, beginning with Armagh. Lord Gosford, then Governor of that county, reported as follows:—"It is no secret that a persecution, accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty which have in all ages distinguished that dreadful calamity, is now raging in this country. Neither age nor acknowledged innocence as to the late disturbances is sufficient to excite mercy, much less afford protection. The only crime which the wretched objects of this merciless persecution is charged with is a crime of easy proof: it is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic faith. A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this species of delinquency, and the sentence they pronounce is equally concise and terrible; it is nothing less than a confiscation of all property and immediate banishment." After declining to put himself or his readers to the pain that a detailed account of the attendant horrors would inflict, his lordship continues: "Where have we read—or in what history of human cruelty have we read—of more than half the inhabitants of a populous country deprived at one blow of the means as well as the fruits of their industry, and driven, in the midst of an inclement winter, to seek shelter for themselves and their helpless families where chance may guide them? This is no exaggerated picture of the horrid scenes now acting in this country; yet surely it is sufficient to awaken sentiments of indignation and compassion in the coldest heart. These horrors are now acting, and acting with impunity."—*Molesworth's History of England*, Ed. 1874, Vol. I., p. 376. It is evident that the words, "the face of a Papist daren't be seen," which still forms the refrain of an offensive party song, had at one time a fearful significance, hardly yet forgotten by the grand-children of the sufferers.

It is right to say that in those early days men of intelligence and some measure of tolerance had not yet taken the management of the lawless Society into their hands. That they did so ultimately resulted in a mitigation of the atrocities of the ignorant and unreasoning mass; but that was not an unmixed blessing. Had the Association remained under the control of the ruthless men who set it on foot, its career would have been short-lived, and much of the embarrassment caused by so potent an element of strife would have been spared to English governments, Whig and Tory. As it is, Orangeism has been made the means of embittering the quarrels of race and religion in the hands of men who gained political capital by setting Ireland together by the ears. The toleration they profess has always found a sad practical commentary in the pertinacity which has clung to every hoary abuse and resisted every honorable effort at reform

and conciliation. The plea that the Roman Catholic population will never be satisfied with any concessions that England may make from a sense of justice would not, even were it true, be the slightest excuse for resisting the plainest dictates of national duty. When everything that can and ought to be done has been effected, the conscience of England will approve of the work, whether it be successful or not. They are the true foes of Ireland's future who withstand *à l'outrance* the simplest measure of justice, and whose reading of the golden rule is distinctly anti-Christian—"Whatsoever ye think it probable men would do unto you, in certain vague and scarcely imaginable contingencies, do ye also unto them."

No one will accuse us of Ultramontane leanings, but we cannot express the reflections which are pressed upon us by the extravagances of this antagonistic phase of religious tyranny and intolerance. It seems singular to an ordinary Protestant, that Orangemen should be deluded by the factitious notion, in which they have been nurtured, that their institution is the chief defence of the reformed religion, instead of being, as it is in fact, a standing stumbling-block in its way. Stranger still, that the effigy of William III., a man singularly in advance of his age in tolerance, and even in his latitudinarian views on religion—should be limned upon the banners of a Society which, from first to last, has been the determined foe of political equality and religious freedom. If proof were wanting of the cross prejudices which prevent the average Orangeman from understanding how to mete out an even measure of justice to his opponents, it is not far to seek. We have only to contrast the insane rage which seizes him when innocuous Irish airs are played in his hearing, with the ostentatious pertinacity with which he deafens the public ear with unmelodious party tunes, wedded as they are to words ridiculing all that a Roman Catholic holds sacred, and reviving, in the most offensive form, the bitterest memories of the past. Orangeism is an anachronism, utterly unfitted for the time or country in which we live. Its most effective period was that in which its garments were most copiously stained with blood. Any one who can imagine for a moment that parading in fantastic garb, or that the noisy performance of offensive airs, can be of service to Protestantism, must strangely mistake the spirit of the age in which we live. The nineteenth century has religious controversies to settle, momentous enough in all conscience; but they must be settled in a rational, tolerant and courteous spirit. It is not by the blare of trumpets, the squeaking of fifes, or the thrashing of sheepskin, that these weighty problems are to be solved. *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis tempus eget.* How far the spokesmen of this society are from mastering the difficulties which beset men on every side, may be gathered from the blatant utterances in which they indulge at their annual assemblages. Want of sobriety in thought and of

moderation in speech, are fitly conjoined with imperfect knowledge of history and total incapacity to appreciate the spirit of the age. It seems scarcely necessary to point out that both in Ireland and in Canada they have not even remained constant to their religious professions. From 1798 until now, the temptations to make the Society a political engine have been too strong for them, and both by temporary alliances and permanent antipathies, it has often been warped out of the traditional groove.

In two Provinces in the Dominion, at least, Quebec and Manitoba, any display of politico-religious partisanship would evidently end in bloodshed. Elsewhere the minority grinds its teeth in secret, and submits to an unavoidable necessity. We are far from crediting Catholics with that studied forbearance to take offence, which arises from indifference or contempt they ordinarily refrain from resisting, because resistance is hopeless. But it may not be out of place to submit to intelligent and honorable Orangemen, whether these annual parades are not dearly paid for in the concealed or forcibly repressed rancor and bitterness they inevitably arouse? If the principles of the Reformation possess the value we assign to them, it is surely not by empty show and declamation that they can be maintained and disseminated. The rights of free thought and private judgment have not yet received complete acceptance even from Protestants—their recognition is yet in the future—but of all policies that *quasi*-religionists could adopt, the most unwise and un-Protestant is that of retrogression. The English Reformation was a notable step in the national progress; but we have mounted higher in our conceptions of civil and religious liberty since 1688. To revert to the crude and imperfect notions of that period, would be to advance crab fashion, by going backwards. Protestantism will cease to be a vital force in the world when it ceases to be the guide and light of the age and the cry of "religious liberty" will soon be meaningless in the nineteenth century, if it contracts itself within the narrow signification it acquired in the seventeenth. Every lover of his country loves its history also, and delights to live by sympathy in the struggles of the past; but he is not blind to their imperfect character, or the faltering steps with which our forefathers toiled toward the dawn. The battles of the Boyne and Aughrim were such steps as Bosworth and Naseby and Culloden were in the sister island; but the true patriot would no more tancy it incumbent upon him to celebrate the former than the latter, especially when the celebration assumes an offensive and irritating guise. Above all things, it is lamentable to see the youth of Canada schooled in wilfulness and disregard of all control, and we fear we must add, as the result of the experiment in Toronto, in deliberate initiation in the slippery paths of organized lawlessness and rowdiness.

The hope may be cherished that, with the progress of the

Dominion, these baneful influences will lose their power. To despair of the growing enlightenment of popular opinion would be a serious blunder, to make the lightest of it; and we believe that with increased intelligence the evil will work its own cure. We have appealed to the well-informed members of the Orange Society because we cannot believe that they are so infatuated with the party fetish as to be inaccessible to reason. In coercive measures we have no faith; we believe neither in Party Processions Acts, nor in the short-sighted policy which more than once rejected Bills for the incorporation of the Orange Society. We have never been convinced of the justice of repressive legislation, for it has always failed. The sound common sense of the people in this free country, where religious dissension should be an exotic, will some day or other lead the Orange Association to disband itself *proprio motu*, as its Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland disbanded it authoritatively in years gone by.

These, it may be contended, were Dr. Smith's opinions ten years ago, and you cannot use them as his views of the situation to-day. I answer, that however much Dr. Smith may change or vary in his opinions, he cannot change history to suit the peculiar twistings of his mind. And I presume that what was history in 1875 is history in 1886. And the fact that Dr. Smith stood almost alone in 1875 in his bold denunciation of Orange tyranny, oppression and lawlessness. And that every year since as men become more intimate with the details of Irish history the more numerous have been the converts to his former views. Until now the whole civilized world is, as it were, up in arms against the arrogance and bare-faced presumption of the Loyal Minority. If there had been a similar retrogression or rather a perversion in the mind of great thinkers and writers on the Irish question, as there has taken place in that of Professor Smith, there would be some ground for the presumption that in 1875 he allowed his zeal to get the better of his judgment. But seeing that the more men study the history of Ireland and its relation to England and the Orange party, the more they become in sympathy with the Irish people, and are shocked and horrified to think that ministers of the Gospel should be found stumping the country rousing the latent passions of the people to a repetition of their former exploits in bloodshed and crime. But as Mr. Smith, of Armagh, triumphantly enquires, "What are the antecedents of the men who are clamoring for the Home Rule Bill?" Before we come to answer the question it may be information to him to have a little more of the antecedents of those who oppose it, and considering that they are his own particular friends, it is to be hoped he will direct his luminous mind to the eradication of such detestable vices before he comes again to lecture Canadians on Irish affairs. And seeing that they have no discretion in their abuse of the Irish people, and as they have come here to tell the

truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, they can have no reasonable objection to the people getting a few more flashes of it such as Drs. Kane, Potts, and Smith have not in the multiplicity of their sacred and important duties had time nor inclination to give. Every tree, they say, is to be judged by its fruit. But I believe there are very few trees that produce such a questionable variety of fruit as the Orange Organization, and as this is the season for gathering in the harvest, it may not be unprofitable to rake up the tares. The following statement speaks for itself and needs no observations to render it intelligible :—

THE SHAME AND THE GLORY OF IRISH WOMANHOOD.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* in an article on "births, marriages, and deaths in Ireland," based on the Registrar-General's returns, says :—

Of the children born 112,733, or 97.2 per cent. were legitimate, and 3,218, or 2.8 per cent. illegitimate. Of the children born in wedlock there were 105.2 boys to 100 girls; of the illegitimate births there were 109 boys to 100 girls—a strange fact which the report does not attempt to explain. Taking the illegitimate births in their order of magnitude, they are: Ulster, 4.3 per cent.; Leinster, 2.3 per cent.; Munster, 2.2 per cent.; Connaught, 0.9 per cent. As these are in provinces, we will take the highest and the lowest of the counties in order to show the shame and the glory of Irish womanhood.

The highest in their order of unchastity are—Antrim, 5.8; Armagh, 5.0; Londonderry, 4.8; Down, 4.5; Tyrone, 4.0; Fermanagh, 3.5; Monaghan, 2.8; Donegal, 2.0; Cavan, 1.6. These nine counties are in Ulster. In Connaught, where the average of illegitimate births is 0.9, there are five counties: Galway, 1.5 per cent.; Sligo, 1 per cent.; Mayo, 0.7 per cent.; Roscommon, 0.7; Leitrim, 0.6. In chastity these counties represent the flower of womankind. Let us consider the meaning of these figures. In 1,000 persons in Banff, Scotland, there are 171 bastards; in Shropshire, 85 bastards; in Antrim, 58 bastards; in Leitrim, 6 bastards. If female chastity be virtue, then the above figures show the relative proportions between the virtue of the women of the four counties named.

What can give rise to the great difference between the chastity of the greater portion of the women of Ulster and those of the other parts of Ireland? Dividing Ulster into two portions, Protestants and Catholics, and judging these by the numbers of Protestant and Catholic marriages celebrated last year, we find the proportions to be per cent.:—

	Protestants.	Catholics.	Illegitimate Births.
Antrim.....	80	20	5.8*
Down.....	73	27	4.5*
Londonderry.....	60	40	4.8*
Armagh.....	60	40	5.
Fermanagh.....	54	46	3.5
Tyrone.....	53	47	4.
Monaghan.....	34	66	2.8
Cavan.....	27	73	1.6
Donegal.....	22	78	2.

The counties marked * returned Orange members to the present parliament. It seems that Orangeism and illegitimacy go together, and that bastards in Ireland are in proportion to Orange lodges. No other county in Ireland returns an Orangeman.

It is evident from these statements that the Orangemen do not believe in hiding their "talents in the sand." So that it appears when Dr. Kane referred to Her Majesty the Queen as a "model queen and a model mother, whose exalted example and influence had lifted society in England, Great Britain, and America," he evidently did not know of the unenviable character which the people in the north of Ireland had acquired for themselves, otherwise there is no doubt but he would have qualified his statement by excluding Belfast and its surroundings. But I fear that this flowery passage was a mere figure of speech, intended as a compliment to the more virtuous and loyal people of this Dominion. Who while not professing any thing like the same amount of virtuous loyalty are nevertheless more virtuous and loyal than those who are always ready to make such great sacrifices and professing their undying admiration and approval of virtue, which they never intend to reduce to practice. We have so far been dealing with the riotous and voluptuous propensities of the Orange organization, it will therefore be as well to finish this part of the subject while we are at it by dealing with the riots that have been so frequent and serious in Belfast and its neighborhood; this is the more necessary on account of the almost jocular manner in which Dr. Kane has referred to them.

"The Belfast riots," Dr. Kane said, "he was glad to inform them, had been very much exaggerated. He believed the object of those who organized them—for he thought the evidence would show that they had been organized—was to throw discredit upon that great and growing city. The origin was very simple. The laborers of Alexander Dock discovered that one of their number was a Protestant and an Orangeman and gave him notice to quit and said the time was coming when one of his sort would not be allowed to earn a loaf of bread. The man did quit, and the other men gave him a beating. Then the boys of Queen's Island gave these laborers

a beating. A boy went out on a log in the water and was drowned and his funeral was attended by 20,000 Nationalists and made the occasion of a great demonstration and much excitement." Such then is the levity with which a Grand Master of a Grand Orange Lodge, a preacher of peace and gentleness, a Doctor of Divinity, speaks of one of the most criminal and disgraceful outbreaks that has taken place in any portion of Europe during the past twenty years. I was about to express a fear that the Rev. Dr. has not improved the laws of the landlords and the loyalty movement as it is understood by this people, but on reflection it should be regarded as a matter of congratulation to think that these distinguished lecturers have contributed so much to the discredit of themselves and the selfish party which they represent. For, if the reports given in the newspapers are gross exaggerations, how comes it that in the loyal city of Belfast where the people do not live by agitation but by peaceful and honorable means; how is it that it requires three thousand five hundred military, and two thousand five hundred constabulary, with twenty-two resident and six military magistrates to keep the people in order.

If Dr. Kane is so simple as to suppose that people will believe that the Catholics of Belfast, where they are in a minority, will attack the Orangemen in their stronghold, and in a city where up to the present the magistrates and town councils, police and military, have been on the side of and in undisguised sympathy with the Orangemen, while their friends in the west and south of Ireland who are in a greater majority than the Orangemen in Belfast are setting them such an excellent example, can he imagine for one moment that the people will take in his assertion that the boy Curran went out upon a log and drowned himself, and then that 20,000 Catholics attended his funeral? Where has it ever happened that 20,000 people attended the funeral of any person who committed suicide, or caused their death by any act of carelessness of their own, or will the doctor explain what the boy did to justify the attendance of 20,000 people to his last resting place. These are questions that ought to have suggested themselves to the rev. gentleman before he made such rash statements. But I forgot, he wanted to suit the discourse to the tone of his audience, and discovering that he had the flower of the order of Young Britons before him, he felt warranted in indulging his natural propensities, evidently knowing from experience that the wider of the truth, the louder the applause. But even if we had not already proven by unquestionable evidence that the Orangemen in the North of Ireland had acquired for themselves a notoriety which any respectable organization would be ashamed of; if it had not been shown that several of the doctor's statements are unsupported by any facts as evidence, and when combatted with the evidence cited against him, are found to be at variance with the truth; the inconsistency of 6,000 men being necessary for the preservation of

peace in a town where there was only a little scuffle between two parties in which there could be no doubt as to what the result of a conflict would be, and the unparalleled demonstration of 20,000 persons at the funeral of a self-murderer, that would be the case if the doctor's statement was true, demands such an amount of credulity on our part, that the mere repetition of these irreconcilable statements consigns them at once to the tombs from which they would not be disturbed, had it not been necessary to show a little of the way which the Loyalists have got for manifesting their loyalty. In the first place I must beg to differ with the doctor in the version he has given of the riot in which the boy Curran met his death on the fourth of June.

The man who was working with the laborers at the Alexander Dock was told by the fireman to do something, and being either intoxicated with liquor or in a rage at the time, he refused to do the bidding of a damned Papist, and without any interference on the part of the men, he was immediately ordered off the work by the foreman, and at the same time informed that as long as he, the foreman, had anything to do with the job he would never get a day's work there again for his impudence. He went away and informed the brethren on the Queen's Island that he had been discharged because he was discovered to be an Orangeman and a Protestant. So on their way back from work the Orange mob attacked the navies in the most unmerciful manner with stones and pieces of iron bolts and nuts, pursued them with such violence that one young Curran, who had got away from the crowd, finding himself followed up by several hundred infuriated maniacs, not knowing where to go, made for the water to try and save himself from their fury, but he was forced to jump in, rather than get into the hands of his pursuers, and not being a swimmer they watched him, lest he should escape, so he was drowned in the presence of hundreds who could save him if they desired to do so. And as he was the first victim of their vindictive and savage conduct, the people marked the sign of the cowardly act by turning out in thousands to his funeral. But as the whole press and even the police, there old friends, have, it would seem, according to the Belfast delegates' account, turned, or rather conspired to destroy the good name of the peaceful city, we will give part of a lengthy report from the associated press as it appeared in the *Freeman* on the 19th June :—

In the afternoon the Orangemen renewed the attack on the house of Mrs. O'Hare, which had been burned the preceding night, the rioters now bestowing their attention on the stores in the rear of the premises. The assistance of the police was at once looked for, but for a rather lengthened period there was not a sufficient force to cope with the sackers of the stores. At length a sufficient force, at least what was deemed a force capable of protecting the property and dealing with the plunderers, arrived on the scene,

but only to meet with stubborn resistance from the people in possession of the place. A terrible fight ensued, the police using their batons with great vigor, and forcing the crowd again and again to retire.

Great numbers of the rioters fell before the batons of the police, and one man, it was reported, was killed. This rumor helped to add fuel to the fire, and the crowd, which had swelled to enormous proportions, swept down on the police, and succeeded in driving them back. The police, however, repeated the charge, and so the battle raged, neither party acknowledging defeat, till at length the Rev. Hugh Hanna and Rev. Mr. Johnston intervened. The former rev. gentleman advised the people to retire, but they laughed his advice to scorn, and as a last remedy he suggested that the police should retire to the Bowers hill Barracks convenient. District Inspector Greene, for the sake of restoring peace, did retire, but this had only the effect of encouraging the mob, who redoubled their efforts, and drove the police into the shelter of the barrack. No sooner had the police got inside than volley after volley of paving stones were hurled in through the windows, completely demolishing them and endangering the lives of the men.

Mr. MacLeod, R.M., then read the riot act, and the police poured out a deadly fire upon their assailants from the door and the windows of the barrack. The red flame from the rifles was almost a continuous sheet, as buckshot and bullet sped on their errand of death, but the bullets seemed to have no effect on the attacking party, who rushed up to the very windows of the barrack, and hurled their missiles through them. Volley after volley came from the police, and men and women fell, and the crowd wavered and retired, but to renew their attack with greater determination. For upwards of two hours, from after 9 till almost 11 o'clock, this awful fight was waged, and yet there were no signs of relief for the besieged party, and the besiegers showed no signs of retiring. This absence of a rescuing party for such a lengthened period may be accounted for by the fact that the telegraph wire connecting the barracks with the other stations in the town had been cut, and there was no means of communicating with the authorities as to the state of affairs.

The above paragraph gives some explanation how it is that the police have been compelled to deal somewhat severely with the Orange mobs in order to protect themselves. It is not a matter calculated to create much sympathy in the minds of the policemen, who after the advice of the Orange leaders had been adopted, to retire rather than take very vigorous steps to disperse them, to attack the police as soon as they imagined they had them in a fix, and the fact that six persons lost their lives in the conflict I have cited, and seventeen had to be taken to the Royal Hospital show conclusively that these riots have not been overstated. Again on Satur-

day the 1st of August there were over 100 police wounded in a conflict with the Orange rioters. Dr. Kane tries to put the blame either on the Catholics or the country police sent into the city to preserve order, but permit me to call the rev. gentlemen's attention to the following editorial in the Belfast *Evening Telegram* a loyal organ of a loyal cause :

"Only a few weeks ago we had to denounce the acts of the country police—now we cannot avoid stating that, in the opinion of the great majority of the people of Belfast, the town police are behaving as badly. The gross partiality displayed by the officers is not surpassed by the ruthless brutality of the men under their command. 'Morleyism' seems to have so impregnated the minds of both the leaders and the rank and file that they alike appear to have become incapable of discriminating between right and wrong where the preservation of the peace is concerned."

The writer of the above paragraph seems to be a worthy disciple of the apostle Kane, for according to him it was "Morleyism," not paving-stones on their heads, that perverted their minds, and turned the bonds of fellowship and sympathy that used to exist between them into that of indignation and contempt. But however reprehensible it may be to attack a body of police, there is something manly and courageous about it which to some extent mitigates the folly or the crime of such an act, and bad as it is will stand out in bold relief when contrasted with the conduct of the rioters in attacking a party of excursion girls who could not have been very offensive, when we have regard to the amount of consideration which they showed in leaving that morning without their usual procession, in order not to irritate the already excited feelings of the loyalist rowdies, and as it may furnish solid food for reflection to some who have not decided with which they will cast in their lot, I will give the report complete as it is given in the *Freeman's Journal* on August the 7th:—

COWARDLY ATTACK ON CATHOLIC GIRLS.

This evening rioting was renewed on a scale which dwarfs almost into insignificance the previous lawless outbreaks of the Orangemen which have disturbed Belfast during the past two months. The bigotry, the intolerance, and the cowardice of the mob of the lodges received striking illustration this evening, when a most savage attack was made on a number of Catholic girls on their return from an annual trip to the seaside. The excursionists consisted of about 600 young girls members of a sodality attached to St. Joseph's Church, Dock street, and their friends. They left this morning by special train from the North Counties terminus, York street, for Larne, on the Antrim coast, in the charge of the Rev. Father Owens, Adm. They did not proceed to the terminus in processional order, nor had they banners or insignia of any kind displayed. Every effort

indeed was made to keep the trip private, and had there been any grounds for anticipating that it would have led to the awful scenes which occurred on the return of the girls to town it would of course have been postponed, Dock street being the centre of an Orange district in which millworkers and Queen's Island artisans reside. Intelligence of the excursion was circulated during the day, and about 7 o'clock, the hour at which the party were expected to return, an enormous crowd had assembled around the terminus to give the little girls a welcome home in a truly Orange fashion. The authorities fortunately got wind of the intention of the Orange mob to attack the excursionists, and as early as five o'clock all the available forces of police, augmented by a detachment of the West Surrey Regiment, and a corps of the 4th Dragoons, were drafted into York street. This street is a fine open thoroughfare, running along for about a mile in a straight line with innumerable streets branching off it at each side. The police were divided into parties of six, and a party was stationed at the head of each street running off the main thoroughfare. The military occupied Upper and Lower Henry street, situated about the centre of York street, and outside and inside the terminus parties of police and military were also posted. The special train conveying the confraternity arrived at York street at half-past seven. The Mayor (Sir E. J. Harland, Bart.) was at the terminus, and having had an interview with Fr. Owens requested the rev. gentleman not to display any banners while proceeding homewards. Father Owens informed the Mayor that the girls had no banners with them. His Worship expressed pleasure at hearing this, and congratulated Father Owens on the good order in which the girls and their friends and relatives who had accompanied them, had returned from their excursion. The girls then left the terminus, and were received with groans and execrations by the crowd outside. About a dozen hackney cars were available, and these were at once engaged by parties of the excursionists.

The scenes which now ensued baffled description. Attacks of a cowardly and savage character were made on the young girls by the mob. The police in the neighborhood were altogether too few to cope with the enormous mass of rowdies who blocked the thoroughfare, and made fine sport pulling the girls off the cars, beating them, and depriving many of them of their baskets and satchels. Some heroic efforts were made by the elderly male and female relatives of the little ones to protect them from the brutality of the mob. I saw several old women and men, apparently grandmothers and grandfathers, endeavoring to keep back the crowd with their umbrellas. I saw the umbrellas wrenched from the old folks by Orange "heroes" and smashed on the heads of the women, and the men pulled off the cars, knocked down and kicked. The cars, which, after a struggle, managed to escape from the first mob, had to run the gauntlet of

other mobs all the way up York street. Further on up the street I saw several of the cars stopped, and the occupants treated in the same manner as the early victims of the fury of the crowds. While this cowardly work was in progress the noise and tumult caused by the screams of the girls, the shrieks of the injured, the horrid imprecations and blasphemies of the mob, and the shouting of the police were increasing and awful to hear.

THE ACTION OF THE CONSTABULARY.

Of the constabulary it must in truth be said that they behaved themselves bravely and well. In the vain endeavor to protect the numerous groups of the excursionists, who sorely needed protection, the small parties of police separated, and numbers of them were individually isolated in the midst of the mob, who, it need not be said, bore them no love. Fortunately, most of the men were armed with rifles, and, clubbing with these weapons, they were able to fight their way out of the crowd. Again and again attempts were made by them to force a passage through the crowd for the excursionists. A tram car heavily laden outside and inside with the girls and their friends was stopped when it had got but a short distance from the terminus and a determined attempt was made by the crowd, who surrounded the car on all sides, to oust the occupants from their positions. Windows were broken with stones, and one man on top of the car, while endeavoring to shield himself from the missiles, fell down into the street, where he was surrounded by several young ruffians and brutally kicked.

FUGITIVE EXCURSIONISTS.

The excursionists who could not procure seats either on the hackney cars or on the trams sought shelter in the bye streets, but they did not escape the attention of the mob even there. Parties of the rioters followed them down the streets and despoiled the girls of the bunches of flowers and evergreens which they had brought with them from the country. The police, hard pressed though they were in the main thoroughfare, ventured down these bye streets in small parties when they witnessed the attacks on the Catholic girls. The men suffered severely indeed for their courage, for in these streets the rioters possessed an abundant supply of paving stones, which were rather scarce in York Street, and with these dreadful weapons the men were driven back to their former position. I saw several policemen after vainly endeavoring to withstand the volleys of stones hurled at them, turn and fly back into York Street, followed by howling mobs. Incidents of this kind were of occurrence up the entire length of York Street so far as the eye could reach. The entire scene during the half hour which it lasted was one of terrible excitement, and to give any adequate description of it would indeed be impossible. After about half an

hour's fierce struggle all the Catholic excursionists managed to get out of York Street, and now the rioters devoted all their attention to the police. The stone-throwing never ceased, and even knives were used on constables, who, getting detached from their colleagues, were at very close quarters with the mob.

THE DARLING OF THE MOB.

The stipendiary magistrates present were Col. Forbes, R.M.; Mr. Rudford, and Capt. L'Estrange. The latter, who appeared to be the darling of the mob, was loudly cheered whenever he appeared, but while he was being applauded his admirers continued their attacks on the men under his charge. The constabulary forces were about this time massed into a few strong bodies, and these with clubbed rifles charged through the crowd again and again.

A BAYONET CHARGE.

But while the police contented themselves with mild measures of this kind the mob were too many for them, and matters now looked so serious that it was resolved to try what buckshot would do towards quelling the riot. Several shots were fired in succession higher up York Street, and they had the effect of causing a stampede down the bye streets of the rioters in the immediate vicinity of the firing party. Colonel Forbes, R.M., desiring to follow up this demoralization in the ranks of the rioters, brought the military into requisition, and a bayonet charge was made by a detachment of the West Surrey Regiment. The people fled right, left, and centre before the military charge; but higher up and lower down York Street, where the rioters had only the police to deal with, they had everything their own way. The rifle shots could be heard now in every direction, and the sight of several men lying bleeding on the ground, emphasized by several charges by the police and military, had the effect of somewhat dispersing the mob and putting a stop to the stone-throwing. Large numbers of the rioters were driven into the bye streets, and in some of these very serious conflicts took place, not only between the police and Orangemen, but between the Orangemen and Catholics.

WRECKING HOUSES.

The Catholics in the vicinity of North King street, which lies convenient to York street, gathered in a big crowd for the purpose of going down to protect the Catholic girls, word having been brought to them of the attacks on the excursionists by the Orange mobs. On their way to York street the Catholic party were met in Little George's street by the Orangemen retreating from York street, and a conflict ensued. Stone-throwing was vigorously carried on by the two parties. The public house of a Catholic

named McKenna was completely wrecked by the Orange mob. The house of a Catholic named David Sharman, also a publican, and a private dwelling occupied by a Mrs. Waterson, shared the same fate. The street was almost entirely covered with stones, for the riot was kept up in this quarter for fully an hour, and a small party of police who unfortunately for themselves happened to be in the neighborhood endeavored to disperse the opposing crowds, but they came in for a good deal of rough handling themselves.

Dr. Kane will look up the pages of history in vain to find a parallel for this brutal and cowardly attack on these poor girls, and no amount of provocation, even if they had got any, could excuse or extenuate their conduct in the fiendish manner in which they pursued them. It was even more contemptible though not more brutal than the way they attacked poor old Johnson, while attending work unsuspectingly, as he would do, after being in the employment of the Mayor for thirty years. Advantage was taken of him while he was in a stooping attitude; a pot of hot tar was poured over him, he then was knocked down and unmercifully kicked and beaten. But after all there is no great use in shocking one's feelings with a repetition of deeds that if possible should be forgotten, especially as the assertions of the Loyalists are unsupported with one single fact, for even if we admit the contention of Dr. Kane, that the riots were started through the beating of one man, that did not justify the wholesale attempt at murderous retaliation upon the people who had nothing to do with their supposed grievance. How very different the conduct of the Nationalists, when, on the night of the Dublin elections, the Orangemen who after barricading their room in order to protect themselves from the consequences of their malicious attacks, showered down from their windows bottles and furniture upon the heads of the Nationalists as they marched in procession along the street to the candidates' hotel, and because the processionists did not take their broken heads as a matter of harmless diversion in which the Loyalists of former generations used to indulge, without having either of God or man, they, the Loyalists of the Patriotic Union, discharged several revolvers down on the crowd, wounding several people, who did nothing to provoke their hostility, and even if they had any desire to do so could by no possibility reach them, up in the fourth story with all the doors and lower windows securely barricaded with iron bars, planks and stones, showing conclusively that the attack was a cold-blooded and villainous attempt to murder innocent people. Yet as soon as the police took vigorous measure to arrest the leaders in the club room the people dispersed and showed no desire for a revengeful retaliation, such as is the characteristic feature of the vindictive Loyalists in Belfast. Let it also be observed that these are only a few of the many vicious attacks

of the Orangemen that have taken place since the fourth of June; and they are, I fear, not the worst of them, for the newspaper correspondents have been in daily peril of their lives because they did not suppress the truth in all cases by dishing up reports of the proceeding of the Loyal Minority such as they have been in the habit of getting made to order. But that it is not their fault if the truth comes out will appear from the following statement which shows how very anxious the Loyal Minority was and continues to be, that "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" should be known about these peaceful operations. The following statement is taken from the special correspondence of the *Freeman's Journal* of 21st August:—

ORANGE INTOLERANCE.

I have already adverted to the scandalous manner in which certain Belfast papers have misrepresented and distorted facts in connection with the disturbances, and there can be but little doubt that they are largely responsible for the deplorable state of feeling which exists here at present. The accounts given in newspapers, published outside Belfast, of the riots, have been such glaring contrasts to the local versions, that one of these organs has resorted to the mean and spiteful device of calumniating the strangers who have visited Belfast for the purpose of performing the dangerous duty of ascertaining the truth for the journals which they represent.

Through the courtesy of Mr. J. R. Reavis, special correspondent of the *New York World*, I am enabled to give the following extract from the cablegram which he despatched to that journal to-night, in repudiation of this slander. I may mention that this gentleman is a born American, who only visited Europe for the first time a couple of weeks ago. This has, therefore, been the only occasion upon which he has set foot on the soil of Ireland, of which, outside Belfast, he has had no previous experience. The reply, which will appear in the *New York World* simultaneously with this telegram to the *Freeman's Journal*, is as follows:—

"This is a fair sample of the style of journalism with which this city is afflicted, and to which its unfortunate condition is to be largely attributed. There are ten or twelve correspondents here representing New York, London, and Dublin papers. Most of these gentlemen are here for the first time, and every one of them is a Protestant or in sympathy with the Protestant religion. I have been very careful to learn this fact, as the imputation contained in the attack is no less ungenerous than it is untrue. The bigotry and unfairness of the Orange party here are so conspicuous that the sympathies of the unprejudiced visitor—whatever be his religious predilections—naturally fall to the side of the Catholics. The reports sen

from here by correspondents, so far as I have been able to observe, have neither been exaggerated nor grossly biased. If they go to Catholic sources for their information it is because they go into Protestant districts at the risk of their lives. Four local reporters have already been outrageously treated by Orangemen. The truth is, however, that the correspondents have visited the Orange quarters every day, notwithstanding the warnings of the police, who are themselves afraid to go on the Shankill Road."

It is unnecessary for me to comment on the above, further than to say that in the cases of the reporters above referred to, the local prints went so far as to state that the injured gentlemen had been attacked by the Catholics, when the fact was well known in Belfast that they had been beaten by Orangemen, who supposed that they were connected with the staff of the *Morning News*, the only organ advocating the claims of the Catholics in this city.

I am very much afraid that version of it will not correspond with the great solicitude which the Orange deputation has manifested to let the people know "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"; but as it seems to come nearer to the mark than anything we got from them in the Mutual Street Rink, I hope they will appreciate the desire I have shown to assist them in their laudable mission of informing the public in this province of the real state of affairs, as they have been found in the North of Ireland, by men who had no interest to serve in misrepresenting it.

It appears, from the opinion pretty generally expressed, that, after all, Dr. Kane is but a very indifferent orator, and, judging from the speech which he delivered, he cannot have got his degree of D.D. for his powerful reasoning. His address is full of repetitions and inconsistencies, which would make the ordinary working-man blush for shame if he saw his effusions in print, as the Dr. has had the opportunity of doing on several occasions. Being so much accustomed to addressing men who require no reasons whatever from him, whether he is in the pulpit or on the throne of an Orange lodge, he is to be somewhat excused if he does not make any serious attempt at giving causes for the effects which he deplures, nor reasons to justify his assumption that an Irish Parliament would be injurious alike to the interests of Great Britain and Ireland. Mr. Smith, though not much more successful, makes a better attempt; having some practise at the bar, he has to make a slight show of reason, though it is characteristic of the special pleader who is conscious of having a bad case. He skims on the surface of things, and by only telling half the truth he tries to make it appear as the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Mr. Smith evidently thinks he made a great hit by putting Mr. Gladstone in the witness-box, in order to impress his hearers with the important fact that he was a barrister of extensive practise, in very different circumstances to the

number of "unprofessional nothings," who are on the other side ; and he cites Mr. Gladstone as saying, on the 8th of April, that the "essence of the Union is, that before the Union there were two separate and independent Parliaments, one in Great Britain and the other in Ireland ; after the union there was but one." Now I venture to say that Mr. Smith will look in vain through Mr. Gladstone's speech for the expression "two independent Parliaments"; he will find two Parliaments defined, but not two "independent" Parliaments, and, consequently, there is no justification for the conclusion he seeks to draw from that contention, even if we admit it to be correct. For we have the authority of men who were contemporaneous with the two parliaments and who, while admitting the authority of the Irish Parliament to administer Irish affairs, denied that the Irish Legislature was anything more than co-extensive with the English Parliament, and not independent of it. On the 19th May, 1785, three years after the repeal of the "Ponings Act," Mr. Burke, when addressing the House on the Irish Commercial Resolutions, described very accurately the position which Ireland then occupied, and though in many respects it is not flattering the Irish to pretend the sentiments contained in the speech were not resented nor considered in any way offensive, which they undoubtedly would be if Ireland made any pretence to be independent of Great Britain at that time. "Ireland," he said, "was now a co-ordinate, though less powerful state ; but pre-eminence and dignity were due to England ; it was she alone that must bear the weight and burden of the Empire ; she alone must pour out the ocean of wealth necessary for the defence of it. Ireland and other parts might empty their little urns to swell the tide." This is not very complimentary to Scotland, either, for notwithstanding she had no parliament of her own at this time nor for a generation before, was, nevertheless, according to this definition, placed on a par with Ireland, which had its Parliament in College Green. "Independence of legislatures," continues Mr. Burke, "we have given to Ireland, but no other independence could Great Britain grant her without reversing the order and decree of nature. Ireland could not be separated from England ; she could not exist without her ; she must ever remain under the protection of England, her guardian angel." Thus it has been left for the more enlightened and ingenious Loyalists of the present generation to accomplish, what, according to Burke, is a physical impossibility. No person talked seriously about the separation question when the two Parliaments existed ; and those who did hint at the question did so in order to hide their real motives—that of commercial jealousy ; in the same manner as the Loyalists make use of the Empire cry, as a cloak for their real fears that the monopoly which they have always enjoyed would be checked ; and that henceforth religion nor politics would have nothing to do with the qualification for offices, which, under the more just

and reasonable system that the Nationalists have been advocating for years—that of competitive examination—they would have little chance of succeeding.

But least it should be contended that Edmund Burke, being an Irishman, was partial to his country, I will call into the witness box another man who, though not so distinguished, occupies a more independent position, and was more of a kindred spirit in so far as his religious opinions were concerned to the Loyalist of this enlightened age. In addressing the House of Lords on the question of a union in 1800, Lord Minto said: "Ireland claims a sovereign independent Government, and that claim is freely admitted by our own; while we exercise, nevertheless, with the acquiescence of Ireland, an open ascendancy and control in every one of its concerns, Ireland must take her part in all the wars of Great Britain; she must bear her share of her burthens and incur all their hazards. She may lose a province or may become herself a province of the enemy, yet Ireland cannot by the utmost success of the war, acquire an acre of new territory to the Irish Dominion. Every acquisition made to the forces of the Empire, however great her share may have been in the danger or exertion, accrues to the Crown of Great Britain. Ireland claims no sovereignty in any one of the foreign possessions or provinces of the British Empire. The Irish Parliament has never asserted or conceived the right of legislating for any of the conquests of the King of England, that is to say of the King of Ireland. Ireland has planted no colonies, but has furnished planters to all those of Great Britain. In a word, this whole class of sovereign rights and capacities, however inherent in the very nature of sovereignty, is wholly wanting in that of Ireland. If we were asked to define, or at least to describe an independent sovereignty, should we err much by saying it is a state which can make war and peace, which can acquire dominion by conquest and which can plant colonies and establish foreign settlements. And if we wish to describe a subordinate and dependent country, could we do it better than by saying it is a country that must contribute her quota of all the wars of a neighboring kingdom, must incur all the risks of these wars and partake in all their disasters, while all that is acquired by their success falls, like the lion's share, to that country with which it claims to be co-ordinate and co-equal." There we have the position of Ireland, placed in a nut shell, and all the declarations of the Loyalist army cannot alter that fact.

What reason, I would like to know, had England to apprehend any danger from a country in a position such as Lord Minto in the foregoing paragraph describes it? According to this depression of Ireland's relation to Great Britain, before the "Paper Union" was forced upon the Irish people, England was all powerful for good or evil. No matter in what

daring or reckless enterprise she might enter upon, Ireland was powerless to prevent her, all she could do was to grumble and protest; she had to pay the piper whether she enjoyed the music or not. But let us see what Mr. Smith says: "The essence is that by the Act of Union two separate and independent bodies were united in one as man and woman are by the act of matrimony made one for all time afterwards. That is the essence of the union, and anything that destroys that essence is the repeal of the union."

Mr. Smith is very homely in his illustrations, no doubt with a desire to accommodate himself to the understanding of his audience, but I fear that the union of which he speaks is the union of the wolf and the lamb, or the sheep and the bear. If this matrimonial illustration is to be taken seriously, it would go to justify some of the foulest, most dark, and abominable crimes that ever were committed, even in the worst days of sensuality in any country on the face of the globe. According to this argument any voluptuous villain may try and induce a girl by cunning and deceitful arts away from her home or from her first love, and if he cannot succeed in getting her consent to a marriage in which she sees nothing but selfishness from beginning to end, he may use violence and compel her when he has got her within his power, he can trample upon her in face of the protests of her friends who may be powerless to help her. She may have been tied at the altar while using every effort to protect herself from the outrage intended to be committed upon her. If Mr. Smith had been trying to make his cause ludicrous he could not have been more unfortunate in his simile than the one he used in order to convince his hearers of the sanctity or irrevokable nature of the union of Ireland with England than to compare it with a matrimonial union. I wonder what Mr. Smith would think if his daughter was forced away at night and compelled to submit to a marriage which she felt to be worse than death, suppose that even after the first disagreeableness of the compulsory ceremony was over that she found all her fears of violence and cruelty more than realized, that the numerous pledges which her destroyer had given to her friends and herself, in order to bribe them to a concurrence in the obnoxious union, were broken, that every day she lived brought increased misery and poverty to her door; suppose that some of her friends, alarmed at the state of her health and moved to compassion at her pitiable condition, took steps to have the union dissolved on the ground of continued cruelty and that it was effected by fraud and force and consequently could not be binding. Suppose that it was contended in the courts and in the press that the marriage ceremony having been performed it did not matter whether it had been accomplished by fraud, or force, or whether the marriage had turned out a happy one or not, it would be setting an example, which, if once established, might lead to the disintegration or destruction of the

Empire. How eloquently Mr. Smith would wax in denouncing the villains who betrayed and sold his daughter to a selfish ravisher, who had played the tyrant every day since she was forced into the trap that had been set for her. How would he not proclaim that a marriage accomplished by fraud and force and followed up by cruelty and a system of selfish oppression, spies and detectives, who dogged her steps, whether at home or abroad, where she was ordered about by the greatest knaves and prostitutes the scums of London and other English cities could produce; when her wishes were only consulted in order to find out what she regarded as most precious and essential to her happiness, with a view of inflicting greater mortification by having them denied? Would Mr. John Smith, barrister-at-law, in the Town of Armagh, who, according to his reply to Mr. Ryan, is very particular about getting all the petty titles to which he considers himself and Dr. Kane entitled, would this great barrister of "large and increasing practice" consider that such a "union" or marriage solemnized under the disgusting and revolting circumstances I have here supposed to have been the miserable lot of Miss Smith, would he defend such a union, even if it was sought to be enforced upon his chamber maid, would he not rather denounce it and the laws under which such barbarous, but refined cruelty was possible? Where is the man not bereft of his senses or destitute of the ordinary feelings of humanity that could stand by and look indifferently on such usage, even if it was inflicted on an orphan girl with whom he was in no way connected? Yet such I am sorry to say is but a feeble and imperfect, or rather a colorless picture of the way in which the Irish nation, or rather her marriage contract with England, was brought about, and only a slight indication of the systematic oppression that has been enforced upon Ireland ever since the Union, and all the assertions of Irish prosperity and Irish disloyalty that Mr. Smith or the whole Loyal Minority can make will not alter the facts connected with such an unfortunate transaction. If, therefore, it would be regarded as a base and cowardly action on the part of any person to stand up and defend the marriage that I have pictured and to demand a continuance of that duplicity and selfish rapacity already referred to, does it occur to Mr. Smith that a briefless barrister could be found with sufficient cheek to stand up before a jury and ask for a verdict for the defendant in such a case? No, not one could be found, unless some drunken God-forsaken snob, who had bartered his senses with his honor for a "nip" of whiskey or a drink of ale. But what would be the horror and amazement of the public or a jury if in the course of the litigation which we have imagined for the accommodation of our loyal and learned instructors, what, I say, would be the feelings with which a man would be regarded who was not only to put himself in the witness box and give evidence

during the trial, but to plead at the Bar or on the platform against the plaintiff, to deny that her marriage was a forced one, to plead in face of voluminous evidence that she was much better off than she had ever been before the marriage, that she was far better treated than she deserved to be, and declaring at the same time that he was a near relation to her, that the same blood circulated in his veins from the "top of his head to the sole of his foot," and that on that account and on that ground alone, if he had no other reason, would oppose to the death a dissolution of the marriage? Would not such a man be regarded as a monster in human shape? And when Mr. Smith points to an imaginary John Smith stealing some of his employer's goods and spoons and yet retaining his confidence to an extent that seemed unnatural; when he triumphantly enquires, how long do you think the photograph of a business man in Toronto, who would place a fellow like John Smith in charge of a branch establishment in Montreal, would be up for sale in the windows and bought by thousands? He would be classed as a lunatic. I answer that it would be up as long and bought as freely as the photograph of the noble-souled gentleman whom Mr. Smith's candid illustration rendered it necessary for me to describe. But let us pursue the allegory a little further, especially as it is the battle-field chosen by the representative of the loyal and patriotic union, we cannot be suspected of a want of courtesy or unfairness in following where he leads. Would Mr. Smith or Dr. Kane consider the marriage I have described, a union, or would he not be inclined to think that if it was a union, it was only a "paper one," and was worse than useless, even admitting that it had not been so very injurious? Would it not occur to him, that if some guardian angel was to use his angelic influence in bringing about a rearrangement, or if need be a divorce, whereby the suspicion and petty jealousies would terminate, by which the services of bullies and prostitutes could be dispensed with, and all these interested overseers who infested the household to the distraction and consternation of the inmates as well as the owner? Would he not say that anything which could bring about a consummation so devoutly to be wished for, was deserving at least of respectful consideration, if not of hearty approval. If, therefore, the course I have indicated would be so dishonorable and wicked that no sane or honorable man would identify himself with a movement for the purpose of keeping one poor woman in misery, how much more reprehensible does the action become when we find instead of one person it is a nation, and millions of people that are suffering from the evil effects of a union brought about by circumstances more criminal and revolting than any I have described, and would it be any excuse or palliation for the infamous conduct of this or that person to get up and declare that they were the particular friend of the lady who sought some relaxation of the marriage

which had been so productive of misery and woe, and that they were bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh, and were as such determined to oppose any loosening of the bonds that bound them together? Would not such unnatural and insincere professions of friendship be regarded not only with suspicion but an unpardonable aggravation of the offence? Yet such is the foul and blasphemous language indulged in by the two distinguished orators, who cannot, it appears, from a report of their speeches in the *Mail*, speak for five minutes without declaring to their hearers that they are Irish to the back bone, or to use another of their most elegant and classical phrases, "from the top of the head to the sole of the foot." Well may the people of Ireland pray in the simple earnestness of their enthusiastic nature, "Oh Lord, preserve us from our friends," for we fear not so much "our enemies."

So much in the meantime for Mr. Smith's union, and he is welcome to all the domestic comfort or consolation he can derive from it. But of what use is reason or argument in the face of the magniloquent passage before which even a Cicero or Demosthenes must be silent? We are told in language burning with sarcasm that "the Union was carried by

BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION,

and that those who want to maintain it want to maintain bribery and corruption. We are not here to defend those who brought about the union; but we are here to say that by whatever means it was accomplished it has eventuated in good for the nations concerned. It has increased their power. It has sent their enterprise, commerce and intellect over the length and breadth of the world. Under it we have placed our stamp on the progress of the nations. Under it we have sent into your battlefields men who have never turned their backs upon a foe. (Cheers.) Under it we have sent to your Senate statesmen who have added glory to the name of Britain over the length and breadth of the globe. (Cheers.) Under it we have taken part in your every straggle. We have in short added to the glory of the British flag, and are we to blame if we seek to live and die under that flag?"

Not a bad bill of special pleading, Mr. Smith, providing you were addressing only your Orange friends, whose applause is always to be measured by the magnitude of the falsehood and the extent to which you show your confidence on their credulous and perverted imagination. But unfortunately, or rather I should say fortunately, facts cannot be contradicted by any amount of wind you blow at them. I for one would bet that if Mr. Smith had tried to prove all or any of the assertions contained in the above paragraph, he would have undertaken one of the most difficult and impossible tasks that ever he attempted since the eventful and hopeful morning when he got his first brief. Now who are all the great statesmen

which the Union has given to the Empire? There is not one Mr. Smith can name of any ability either before or after the Union that would be seen going into the same lobby in the House of Commons with Mr. Smith or any of his loyal friends upon Irish questions, and as Mr. Smith puts himself as an authority in opposition to Mr. Gladstone that the Union brought about a reciprocal feeling of affection and interest between the two countries, by uniting them more closely together, it may be interesting for some of his admirers to know that at a time when the leading statesmen whom Ireland gave to the Empire had special opportunity for knowing whether a union, which to some extent controlled Irish Legislation, was better for the country than a relation that extinguished the power of the Legislature altogether, and places it, as has been the case for the past 86 years, in the Imperial Parliament. These statesmen, having taken an active part in Irish affairs previous to 1782, the year in which the Posing's Act was repealed, giving what is generally known as Grattan's Parliament the power to manage its own affairs, these gentlemen knowing the state of the country during these two periods ought to be in as good a position to judge of what was regarded as unity and disunity, prosperity or adversity; as the loyalists of to-day, and when it is remembered that they were all Protestants with a stake in the country, they cannot be suspected of any desire to destroy the connection with the Protestant religion, such as is indicated would result from Home Rule. The following statesmen whom I am about to bring into Mr. Smith's witness-box are so well known to students of Irish or British history, that their integrity, ability nor loyalty needs no recommendation, as their names are a sufficient passport for their authority to speak on this question. Colonel Barry, in opposing the Union, said, "It will impair the connection." Mr. Saunderson—"It will endanger, perhaps dissolve, the connection." Lord Maxwell—"It will be ruinous to both countries." Mr. Waller—"The proposed Union will weaken, if not dissolve, the connection." Colonel Vereker—"The Union will effect the downfall of Ireland, the annihilation of her independence, and the separation from British connection." The Right Hon. George Ogle—"A rejection of the Union is the only mode by which the connection can be preserved." Mr. Saurin—"It will endanger the present happy consolation and connection with Great Britain." Lord Mathew—"The Union will tend more to weaken than to fortify the connection." Lord Cole—"The strongest abhorrence of the Union compatible with the most unshaken attachment to the connection." Mr. John Claudious Beresford—"It will undermine the welfare and subvert the liberties of Ireland and endanger the connection." The Right Hon. W. B. Ponsonby—"I oppose the Union from an anxious desire to maintain the connection." Mr. R. French—"The Preservation of the Irish Parliament will encourage and maintain the connection." Mr. Georges—

"The happy communion with Great Britain is best maintained by the constitution of 1782." Mr. George Ponsonby—"The Parliament which so recently protected the Irish Crown is the firm and saving bond of British connection." Mr. Lee—"Was opposed to the Union because the people delighted in the British connection." Mr. Bushe—"Union is alienation of British connection." Mr. Peter Burrowes—"This Union not only menaces the connection, but the constitution itself." Mr. Flood, Mr. Grattan, Lord Clairmont and Mr. Arthur More opposed the Union. Lord Farnham in 1798, said, "A Parliament perfectly distinct from, and independent of the other, forms a system the most critical and complicated; to a common observer utterly impracticable, but experience has proved that in the midst of popular turbulence and in convulsions of rancorous and violent party contests, the Irish Parliament as it is now constituted (that is two years before the Union) is fully competent to protect this, which is the weaker country." Mr. Brownlow, Sir William Osborn, Mr. Burgh, Mr. Daly, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Foster, not of buck-shot fame; Mr. Yelverton, Mr. Brown, Mr. Welsh, Mr. Bagenal, Mr. English, Mr. Heartly, and a host of other Irish statesmen previous to the Union, who are too numerous to mention, leaving out of consideration Mr. Burke, Mr. Sheridan, besides many of the leading statesmen in the Imperial Parliament, who are always ready to defend Irish rights, no matter from what quarter the attempt was made to curtail her privileges. Thus we see that all the statesmen of any importance that Ireland gave to the Empire previous to the Union were on the side of their own country on every occasion when her liberties were imperilled. It will be for Mr. Smith to give a list of the great names on his roll call the next time he undertakes to enlighten the public. Now what is the case since the Union; the same monotonous tale, all the men of natural energy who have made a name for themselves in politics, in commerce or philosophy, have been without exception on the popular side.

"May I not mention the brilliant Lord Dufferin," says Mr. Smith, "as an instance of the great statesmen that Ireland gave to the Empire that we love so well." Well, if Mr. Smith was a leader in the field of battle, fighting against the proclamations or enforcements of Acts of Parliament passed by the Irish Legislature, and he was as obliging and accommodating in his military movements as he is in his oratorical flights by leaving sufficient ammunition in the trail of all his marching to accomplish the destruction of the little band of Loyalists, and we took him prisoner, as he was bound to be, I believe that in consideration of his simple candor in thus assisting the defeat of his cause and himself he would be very humanely treated. Arch-traitor to his country and all, as he undoubtedly is, he deserves our thanks however for mentioning Lord Dufferin whose administration in the Dominion enabled him to see not only

that two Parliaments and true loyalty were compatible and not inconsistent principles, but that the former is essential to the latter. And as Mr. Smith could so far forget himself as to say that the Irish people did not know that they were slaves until the agitators for Home Rule told them so; did not even know they were oppressed until Mr. Parnell and his lieutenants proclaimed it to them, I will accept Lord Dufferin as a witness whom Mr. Smith was very anxious to cite. In dealing with "Irish Emigration," that is, the Loyalists' cure for all the evils that flesh is heir to in Ireland, and the "Tenure of Land in Ireland," Lord Dufferin said from Elizabeth's reign until a recent period the various commercial confraternities of Great Britain never for a moment relaxed their relentless grip on the trades of Ireland. One by one each of our recent industries was either strangled in its birth or bound to the jealous custody of the rival interest in England, until at last every fountain of wealth was hermetically sealed up and even the traditions of commercial enterprise have perished through destitution. What has been the consequence of such a system pursued with relentless pertinacity for over two hundred and fifty years? Loyalists of Ireland and Toronto, who cheered at the mention of Lord Dufferin's name, read this and think of it.

"What," he asks, "has been the consequence? This, that debarred from every other trade and industry, the entire nation flung itself back on the land with as fatal an impulse as when a river whose current is suddenly impeded, rolls back and drowns the valley it once fertilized." Even the Tory Duke of Wellington is after all a most unfortunate example too in the present dispute. He resisted Catholic emancipation so long and systematically, and declared so often and determinedly that such an Act would never be granted, and that he would resist it to the death. Yet he did not live to be much older before he advocated and urged upon the King and his Cabinet the passage of the Emancipation Bill as a means for the preservation of the Empire, which should make any person who has the slightest regard for themselves to think twice before they would cite such a man as an authority on the Irish question. As time will not permit to enumerate all the statesmen who have shown themselves to be worthy representatives of their country since the Union, we will be willing to give ten to one any time Mr. Smith likes to try the experiment. But let us dissect the paragraph a little further. He says we are not here to say by what means the Union was accomplished; it has eventuated in good for the nations concerned; it has increased their power; it has sent their enterprise, commerce and intellect over the length and breadth of the world. Well, after all, it seems to be true that no matter how dark and doleful a picture may be, it has its light shades as well as dark ones, and no doubt many of the loyal Britons who cheered that sentiment saw at once the farce, though not the absurdity of

it, and might have some reason to look back and bless the landlord, and the day upon which they were evicted and sent adrift upon the road-side with the usual proclamation to all the tenants in the district, that if they should comply with the dictates of God, humanity and nature by giving them shelter, they also would have to go the same road. They no doubt thought that in their case the landlords and the Union under which such a system of wholesale extermination is possible, were after all only sending the enterprise, commerce and intellect over the world, and nobody but knaves or fools would try to stop it. This, I confess, when put together with the millions who died or were starved to death in the process, is not only a rose color, but an original way of looking at it, which the stupid Nationalists have not got the wit or gumption to see or admire. Still even this beautiful passage, like most productions of a special pleader, has its defects. It might well be contested whether, after all the advantages England has received as much of this enterprise and intellect as she would have command of, if the people had stopped at home. Some foolish people are unreasonable enough to think that the United States has derived most benefit from this casting adrift of a people who, if allowed to remain at home under more favorable circumstances, would become a tower of strength to the British Empire. When, as according to the acknowledgment of the Unionist and Loyalist press, the more powerful America becomes the more dangerous it will be for the British Empire, for it is Irish enterprise and intellect that has contributed largely to make it what it is, and should it ever come to pass that the Irish element will have the majority in the Government of the States, and the English Parliament continues to disregard the wishes of the Irish people, the Empire, or those who compose it, may have serious and substantial reasons for wishing that Irish enterprise and intellect had not spread itself as far and as numerous from home as the selfish interest of landlordism required. I hope, however, to be excused, if for sake of the Irish people and the British Empire, the rebel or the loyal elements of the Irish people do not feel justified in approving of a system which has robbed their own country of those elements of influence and power which have gone to build up other nations at the expense of their own.

But when two gentlemen come three thousand miles to lecture a people on the history and conditions of a country in whose welfare they may be interested, it is not enough, especially if they profess to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; it is not enough to make wild and generally figurative statements in a controversy of so much importance, and where there is so much diversity of opinion, he should be able to give some facts or authority for his assertions. There can be no reasonable doubt but that since 1800 England or the British Empire has made great strides in advance of what she was before, but has this unquestionable and extra-

ordinary progress been confined to England alone, or was it owing to its connection with Ireland, or in spite of that connection, or what is of more importance and certainly pertinent to the subject, has Ireland shared in this prosperity? These are the questions raised by Mr. Smith but he was evidently too much of the special pleader to even try and answer them. The two former questions, although very important in their relations to the main one at issue, I will dismiss with this observation: that all the civilized countries have made great progress in the same period; that neither England nor any other place has made progress so rapid and so great as the United States and Canada in the same period, and that whatever progress the British Empire has made since the obnoxious Union, has been in spite of the evil influence and injurious effects of that union, and not through it, as Mr. Smith would have people to believe, for whatever strength or assistance England might have derived from the Irish soldiers, she had the same advantage when the Irish people managed their own affairs, and would have the same again under similar circumstances with the addition of increased loyalty, such as a Union of interest and affections is calculated to produce. Now, it is an undeniable fact that every nation on the face of the earth that goes under the designation of being civilized has made great strides the last 86 years, and even if Ireland had made considerable progress it would be a stretch of the imagination to attribute her progress in the general march of improvement to the Union as established in 1800, admitting even that the Union was made by the consent and at the request of the Irish people, which unfortunately was not the case, and that this question is beyond doubt or cavil is evident from the fact that neither Dr. Kane nor Mr. Smith, who have shown through their tour so far a systematic disregard of the truth, have not with all the pulpit or legal brass on their countenances, hinted a doubt about the villainous way in which the Union was brought about, nor even insinuated that it was with the concurrence of the Irish people, notwithstanding the demands which they make on the credulity of the people in asking them to believe that Mr. Parnell nor his party does not represent the Irish people, but that it is the Loyal Minority who are the true ambassadors of the Irish race. I have observed that even if Ireland had made any considerable progress in 86 years, it is only what was natural and reasonable to expect. But if we find that while all other nations, England included, had made unparalleled progress during this period, but that Ireland so far from sharing in the general distribution of wealth, has actually been getting poorer, there are only two conclusions that are capable to be drawn from these unfavorable circumstances, namely, that the Irish people are incurably bad and unimprovable, or that the Union has all along been one-sided, that it was a union of the shark and his pray. As to the former proposition that the Irish people

are incurably bad, it need only to be mentioned to be dispensed from further consideration, for some of the greatest statesmen in all the new countries have been Irishmen; some of the greatest enterprises on this continent have been started and are conducted by Irishmen. So that we are left with the latter painful alternative, and as it is desirable that those who attribute the misfortunes of Ireland largely to the evil genius of the Union, it is only right that they should state some reason or facts to justify that belief.

If the Union has "eventuated for good to the two nations concerned," detractors and enemies of your country and your race, where are the benefits that have been conferred upon Ireland that she could not have enjoyed more fully with her own parliament? It is customary in all courts or commissions of enquiry that witnesses on both sides of an action who are supposed to be able to throw the least ray of light on the investigation are called by both sides to the contention, if it is not sufficient for a counsel on either side to tell the judge or the jury that the other side is all wrong, that they are only a pack of criminals, and that he had a bag full of documents and a host of witnesses to prove it, he must produce the documents and put the witness in the box, or else according to all known rules of evidence and reason he will lose the case, as the conclusion which the jury will very justifiably draw will be, that if there had been so much evidence either written or oral they would only be too glad to produce it in order to get the verdict. But that not being done, the court or jury not unreasonably declare that this bragging, swaggering counsel lost the case. Yet in face of these obvious considerations which cannot but have suggested themselves to the mind of Mr. Smith, who, according to his own admission, cannot avoid putting imaginary witnesses in the box when he thinks he can do so with any degree of advantage, he never condescended to give his hearers one single fact or reason to justify them in believing that Ireland made great progress through the influence of the Union. I trust Mr. Smith will pardon me if in consideration of the important nature of this question, I do not think it advisable to follow his slothful example. I am now about to call into court, if I may be allowed to do so, without infringing on the exclusive privileges peculiar to Mr. Smith's trade, by citing a class of witnesses whom Dr. Kane and Mr. W. Johnson cannot take exception to; and the first I will call is Mr. Pitt, himself the arch-conspirator of the Union, and let us see what he had to say for himself in proposing such a radical change in the constitution of the two countries. The prosperity of Ireland from the year 1782, when they got a repeal of the "Ponings Act," which required the headings of every bill or resolution to be sent to the English Privy Council before being submitted to the Irish Parliament, and to pass them as they were returned without any alteration, that is if they ever

returned. The prosperity of Ireland from that day up to the time of the Union was so great that even the advocates of the Union could not pass it by unnoticed, so in order to get over the difficulty which such an altered state of things would put in their way, they very ingeniously take advantage of a circumstance which they could not overlook, and apparently with as little remorse as that which has characterized the conduct of the Loyal Minority, turn round and use the very great and unparalleled prosperity of Ireland as an argument for the Union.

“As Ireland,” says Mr. Pitt, “was so prosperous under her own Parliament, we can calculate the amount of that prosperity will be trebled under a British Legislature. Britain imports annually £2,500,000 of Irish products all, or very nearly all, duty free, and we export almost a million, and Ireland raises a revenue on almost every article of it.” This has reference to the year 1785. Continuing, Mr. Pitt goes on to say, “But how stands the case now, 1799. The trade at this time is infinitely more advantageous to Ireland. It will be proved from the documents I hold in my hand, as far as relates to the mere interchange of manufactures, that the manufactures exported to Ireland from Great Britain in 1779 very little exceeded one million sterling, articles of produce amount to the same sum; whilst Great Britain on the other hand imported from Ireland to the amount of more than three millions in the manufacture of linen and linen yarn, and between two and three millions in provisions and cattle, besides corn and other articles of produce.” Thus we have the prosperity of Ireland during the period when she had the privilege of making her own laws, a privilege which the Loyalists under the united cloak of self-interest, loyalty and religion seek to deny, and the more destitute they are of the two latter admirable qualities the louder is their declamations against the extensions of liberty and justice, and the more filthy the adjectives they use against their countrymen whom they profess to love. But as there is never very good music with one string to a bow, however strong and perfect it may be, I will call a few more witnesses whose testimony will be equally and irresistibly conclusive. Mr. Charles Gray, afterwards Lord Gray, in opposing the Union cited the example of Scotland, showing that for a period of over sixty years after the union of Scotland with England the former country made no progress until 1781, when the abolition of the heritable jurisdictions was effected, which His Lordship says gave an impulse to the spirit of improvement in Scotland. Since that time the prosperity of Scotland has been considerable, *but certainly not so great as that of Ireland has been within the same period.*”

Just the same as when the Declaration of Rights, giving the Irish Parliament complete control of its local affairs, laid the foundation for the unparalleled prosperity that became so universal throughout the country,

this undisputed testimony of Lord Gray's to the rapid growth of commerce in Ireland under the fostering care of her own legislation and the backwardness of Scotland, with the double advantage of a closer proximity to England, as well as a union of legislature, given, too, in the House uncontradicted by any of the Scotch members who were present, is not only an eloquent attestation to the wisdom and superiority of a native parliament, for the management of national affairs, but also takes away the ground for such invidious comparisons as are sometimes made, between the prosperity of Scotland and the poverty of Ireland, as according to Lord Gray's contention the Scotch people made no progress until the Imperial Parliament had the honesty to carry out the conditions of the Scotch Union by passing such measures as the people required. A policy the very reverse of that which was pursued in Ireland up to a recent date and is conclusive proof not merely to the genuine progress of Ireland, while the people had some practical control over their own affairs, but establishes beyond doubt the principle that no man or nation can manage an individual's or a nation's business so well as the man or the nation itself, and the next best policy to adopt in the absence of a native parliament in any country is to comply with the wishes of the people in the country concerned, a line of action, the wisdom of which though generally admitted and adopted towards other countries, has never been carried out with regard to Ireland. But as the Loyal Minority delight in the company of lords or dukes, it may be said is one of the peculiar virtues of which they boast a pardonable folly for those who sympathize with the struggle of the Irish people and who admire the pluck and perseverance of the unfortunate "nobodies," attorneys clerks, and literary hacks who do not see butcher's meat but once a year, to feel a little elated on finding themselves occasionally in distinguished company, having a natural desire to let their friends and neighbors know all about it. It is, therefore, with much pleasure that I call the attention of the Rev. Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith, or any others who may be under the erroneous impression that Ireland has prospered more through the benign influence of the Union than she did with her own parliament, to the fact that such was not the belief of the great Conservative Lord Chancellor, Plunket, who in giving a description of Ireland in 1799, after describing her as an enthusiastic nation, goes on to say that "she possesses all the means of civilization, agriculture and commerce well pursued and understood; a constitution fully recognized and established. Her revenues, her trade, her manufactures, thriving beyond the hope or example of any other country of her extent. Within these five years advancing with a rapidity astonishing even to herself." But it might after all be contended by a special pleader of "large and increasing practice," that lawyers, politicians and peers of the realm are not in a very favorable position to judge of the actual prosperity or adversity of the country, the large and increasing practise

through the conflicting interests and unsettled state of the country in the one case, the almost princely salary, and personal interests at stake in the others, might lead them to judge the country from their own happy and prosperous condition; and fearing that the altered relations would not improve their circumstances, would therefore have strong personal interests in opposing the Union, and, consequently, give a rose-colored description of Irish prosperity as their reason for resisting a change that might in all probability be injurious to themselves. I think it desirable to descend from the exalted companionship of a Lord Chancellor to that of a common merchant, who, though ignorant of the law, could probably teach our greatest chancellors something of the trade of a country, however insignificant that business may be. On the understanding, therefore, that there is no one can tell where the shoe pinches so well as the person who wears it, the Guild of Merchants residing in Dublin and surrounding districts ought to be able to speak with some authority, and whatever declarations they may make is entitled to as much respectful consideration as a deliverance on the commerce of the Dominion of Canada by the Board of Trade in this city.

The Guild of Merchants met in Dublin on the 14th January, 1799, and passed a unanimous resolution to the following effect:—"Resolved, that the commerce of Ireland has increased, and her manufactures improved beyond example since the independence of this Kingdom was restored by the exertions of our countrymen in 1782." And the bankers of Dublin, who are generally regarded as tolerably good authority on the amount of business done in the country, met on the 18th of December, 1798, and declared in language not to be misunderstood, "that since the renunciation of the power of Great Britain in 1782 to legislate for Ireland the commerce and prosperity of this Kingdom have eminently increased."

Having thus proven, as I think to the satisfaction of all reasonable persons who may read these pages, that Ireland experienced unparalleled prosperity with her own parliament, we have only established part, or at best half of our case, if we are not able to show that her prosperity disappeared with that institution. It will be observed that so far I have not cited an authority but those who were committed to the maintenance of the English Church and English connection with Ireland, and who were consequently not in sympathy with such treasonable or revolutionary principles as the Loyalists are trying to identify the Nationalists with at present, notwithstanding that the men of 1800 were more ardent and patriotic Irishmen, in so far as their aspirations were higher and nobler than the present, if they are to be judged by the way in which they fought the English minister in opposing the Union, so that it follows from Dr. Kane's and Mr. Smith's contention that if Mr. Parnell and his friends are

traitors the authorities whom I have already quoted must have been architects, yet no person ever dared to insinuate such a thing at the time, and it would be interesting to know how, with the knowledge we have of the soundness of these patriots' prognostications by the results they anticipated having followed to the letter, how it can be such a hideous offence for men who have profited by the experience of the past 86 years, and who only seek a relaxation of part of the chain that binds the body and soul of their country to a nation that has never taken sufficient interest in her welfare, and has therefore been like a chain around her neck keeping her in continual misery unequaled in any other country in Europe. But let us come back to the Union, and enquire what has been the result in so far as Ireland is concerned. We have seen on the most satisfactory evidence and unexceptional authority that no country in Europe had a period of such unprecedented prosperity as Ireland experienced during the 18 years of her parliamentary existence; if the Union has been such a great blessing to the Irish people as Mr. Smith asserts, or as we have seen Mr. Pitt predicted from it, Ireland would have gone on from prosperity to prosperity and her population to-day ought to be 12,000,000 or 14,000,000 instead of between four and five, as it unfortunately is at the present time, and the numerous harbors with which Nature has endowed her would be filled with shipping from all parts of the world, instead of a few river steamers and coal hulks hardly fit to cross the channel. If Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith should not return to their respective callings until they have the satisfaction of hearing the sleigh bells ringing along the roads and streets throughout the country, they will find that nature has produced such a change in the atmosphere that Quebec, which was so full of life and energy when they landed in this country, will be like a stagnant pool when compared with the energy and activity produced in the summer season by the influence of the shipping trade from all parts of the world; in short, trade and commerce will have been so frozen out by the laws of nature that all ships of any importance will have disappeared from her port, that the rev. and learned gentlemen would hardly recognize it as the same place at which they landed only a few months before. Well, then, I think it will follow, from what I have already given and what I am now about to produce, that, from causes not difficult to explain, the laws of England and the union of Ireland, as it is now constituted, have done for Ireland what the laws of nature have done for the Province or City of Quebec, only with this very remarkable and disagreeable difference, that, with the change of season or the return of spring Quebec holds up her historic head once more to receive the products of the world, to welcome the sailors who come from every clime and receive from them the glad tidings and products of the various parts of the world, in return for the

good wishes and surplus products of their own. But, alas, with Ireland, no change of season nor circumstances, no tide of general improvement among the nations of the earth, revives her drooping spirits, or brings tidings of happier days to come. And yet, after all the changed appearance in Quebec during the winter season, it is not more apparent than the change which immediately followed the Union in the various parts of Ireland. At the time of the Union there were ships in the Port of Dublin from New York, Philadelphia, Virginia, Prussia, Russia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, France, and other countries, and the Rev. Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith will be deserving of something more substantial than what is vulgarly known as a leather medal, if they discover a ship in any of the Dublin docks from these or any other countries at the present time. There was over fifty mills on the river Liffey at the time of the Union; will Mr. Smith or his reverend friend inform us what has come of them, or where are they now? There were 150,000 of George the Third's troops clothed from the liberty of Dublin; who gets the contracts, who makes the clothes for her Majesty's troops now? There were twenty mills on the little river Dodder, alone, employed in the manufacture of iron, wool, cotton, paper and bleaching, with over 7,000 hands before the Union. Where, Mr. Smith, have these mills and work-people gone to, where are they now? Where is the firm of Collins & Co., of Kaven street, Dublin, who employed over 500; the Palmers of Peter street, who employed over 2,000 people previous to the Union; where are they gone to, Dr. Kane; who or what has taken their place, as an indication of that general prosperity in which Ireland has received such benefits? These are questions to which Mr. Smith should direct his attention when he addresses his particular friends on the 2nd of October, and give them something more than empty declamation, if he wishes to be placed alongside honorable and intelligent men. But there seems to me to be another almost infallible way of judging of the prosperity of an individual or country. When a merchant is doing an extensive business he invariably increases his expenditure in proportion to his increased income; he has a better house, more comfortably furnished, his table supplied with the various delicacies of the season. If, however, through the failure of his customers, he experiences a falling off of business, he finds his income considerably reduced with the same, and his expenditure must decrease in proportion, or he is a ruined man. What is true, therefore, of one merchant is true of a community of merchants, and what is true of a large number of merchants is also true of a nation; and so we shall find this particularly to be the case with regard to Ireland, and that, too, upon an authority which even Mr. Smith will not deny. As the gentleman whom I am about to call as a witness to the fact of Ireland's poverty after the Union

has proved himself one of the worst enemies of his country, and deserves to be mentioned only to be despised; but as it is necessary to take the criminals out of their cells at times to give evidence in cases of importance, so we have to be excused if, for the time being, we rescue the name of my Lord Mounteagle from the oblivion to which it has been long since consigned, to give evidence against his worthy successors, in the same cause of the oppressor against the oppressed. From a table prepared when his defunct lordship was notoriously known as plain Mr. Rice, a table prepared with his Poor Law report, showing the relative increase in the consumption of tea and tobacco and coffee and sugar in England and Ireland from 1785 to the Union, the following is the result of his investigations: Tea increase in Ireland, 84 per cent., in England, 45 per cent.; tobacco increase in Ireland 100 per cent., England 64 per cent.; sugar increase in Ireland 57 per cent.; increase in England 53 per cent.; coffee increase in Ireland 600 per cent.; in England 75 per cent.

Now, these articles that I have just given are all luxuries, and at the time to which they refer, namely, from 1785 to the Union, were even luxuries that no person but those in comfortable circumstances could afford to indulge in, and are therefore the best criterion that can be given of a nation's prosperity. But let us come back to the same authority and see what was the state of things, and let it be borne in mind that after the Union the population increased from between four and five millions, just about what it is at present, up to nearly nine millions in 1846, and that according to the increase in population the consumption of these articles should have increased by at least 300 per cent., and if they have not so increased it is not Mr. P. Spry Rice's fault, for he, like Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith, labored all his days to show how prosperous Ireland had been under the Union, and even accused her of ingratitude because her people were not generous enough to admit or acknowledge it. When, however, we have examined the following figures, the work of Mr. Rice's hands, and, indeed, the only service he ever did to his country, it will be seen that the Irish people are not after all such ungrateful tools as these firebrands continue to represent them.

From the time of the Union to the year 1827, which is the period covered by the following figures, we see the relative increase in the consumption of the same articles to just the reverse of what it was in the former period: From 1800 to 1827 the increase in the consumption of tea in England was 25 per cent.; in Ireland, 24 per cent. Coffee increased in England 1800 per cent.; Ireland, 400 per cent. Sugar increased in England 26 per cent.; Ireland, 16 per cent. Tobacco increased in England 27 per cent.; Ireland, decrease, 37 per cent. Thus we have in the former period, during which the Irish Parliament managed the Irish affairs,

the increase in the consumption of these articles was out of all proportion to that of England, showing the rapid growth and increased prosperity of the country, as was manifest by the greater amount of these soothing, but not necessary, commodities that were consumed. But there is another way in which we can get at the actual state of the country, and that is by looking at its public institutions, and one of the most necessary and honorable institutions in any country is the number of places for the relief and care of the poor, and the amount of support contributed towards them. In a statement prepared some years ago by an eminent surgeon, Dr. Robert Stack, while superintending the institution known as the Meath Street Institution, for the relief of the sick, or better known as the "Sick Poor Institution," the following remarkable passage occurs: "The institution which commenced as far back as 94 has shared the sad reverses which the locality has undergone over which its operations extend. The Liberties of Dublin, once the seat of manufactories and of wealth, have degenerated into the habitation of the decayed or unemployed artisan, the abode of fashion has now become proverbially the haunt of vice, of poverty and of disease; hence while the necessity for such an institution has increased, has become every day more urgent, the supporters of it have proportionately diminished—as the objects of relief have increased its friends have decreased. In order at once to perceive this altered state of things, a mere inspection of the returns made at the different periods is all that is necessary: In 1798, patients, 3,640; income, 1,035 pounds seventeen shillings and one penny. In 1841, patients, 16,195; income, 367 pounds four shillings and tenpence." Of all the proofs and facts that I have given this one is at once the most painful and disgraceful evidence of the pernicious influence of the Union with England as it is now established. We have had so far evidence on the authority of every conceivable profession in the country. And now I come to another very eminent statistician who has no partiality for the friends of Home Rule, if one may judge by his writings, and as it may interest Messrs. Kane and Smith to know that we get all that is worth knowing about the movements of the great satellites in Europe, at the most about eight days later than themselves, we are not after all such a God-forgotten and benighted people as they seem to imagine, for in the *Nineteenth Century*, which I believe is seen occasionally by the people in this Dominion, will be found an article on "The Economic Value of Ireland to Great Britain," by Mr. George Griffin, in which he says: "It seems to be believed, however, according to the return No. B 6, session 1884, that after corrections are made on this head, that of taxation about £6,700,000, represents the contribution of Ireland to Imperial purposes, exclusive of post offices, etc., the contributions of Great Britain being nearly ten times that amount."

In other words, Ireland, while constituting only about a twentieth part of the United Kingdom in resources, nevertheless pays a tenth or eleventh of the taxes. Ireland ought to pay about £3,500,000 and it pays £7,000,000. To that extent of the difference Great Britain is better off in the partnership than could be expected. Again, "At present nearly the whole taxable income of the Irish people is in fact absorbed by the state. The taxable income being about £15,000,000 only, the Imperial Government, as we have seen, takes nearly £7,000,000, and the local taxes are over £3,000,000 more, or about £10,000,000 in all. So large a proportion of taxation to taxable income would be a serious fact for any country, and there can be little accumulation in Ireland under such conditions. Considerations like these, continues Mr. Griffin, which are so material, have, however, made no impression in the Imperial Parliament hitherto, and that has been the case in one reason, among many others. Why on this side of St. George's Channel we should speak with some modesty of the Imperial Parliament being capable of dealing with Irish affairs." In view of the foregoing facts Mr. Smith should get Dr. Kane to invoke all the Chaplains and Grand and Right Worthy Chaplains of the Loyal Orange Order to pray without ceasing for Mr. Smith to be saved from the burden which the accumulation of facts poured upon him by his own friends in order that they may not crush him out of existence like the traitress of old, who, after betraying the gates of the Roman City to the soldiers in return for their bracelets, the indignant commander ordered his men, as they entered the gate, to throw them at her as a mark of the contempt and scorn due to those who betray the country for person or any other consideration, and I confess it is in something of the same spirit that I throw these historical facts at the representative of the Loyal and patriotic Union, and if he does not fall morally crushed and overwhelmed by the glare of light which they throw on his questionable conduct it is because his conscience is much like the elephant's hide, has lost all its sensibility, otherwise he could not be guilty of making such rash statements. It may be said, however, that in establishing the prosperity of Ireland, while under the guidance of her own Parliament, you are proving too much. You are establishing a claim for independence, a repeal of the Union as we have been showing, and which we are determined to oppose to the utmost of our power. Well, let it be supposed that the Irish people demand repeal of the Union, have they not as much right to do so if they have a fancy for self-government as the Loyalists have to oppose it; as they had in demanding Catholic Emancipation, as the Loyalists had to oppose it; as they had in demanding the abolition of tithe, as the Loyal minority had to oppose it? Had they not as much right to demand a system of free and unrestricted education as the Ultra-Loyalists had to oppose it? Had they not as much right to agitate for the disestablishment

of a foreign church as those who pocketed the hard earnings of starving people, whose religion they detested, had to defend and support it? Who ever questioned their rights to claim an extension of the Borough or County Franchise, but those who are now as they have been on all previous occasions their bitterest enemies while they pretend to be the real friends of the people? Who questioned their constitutional right to say to the landlords, thus far have you come in your extermination of the people of Ireland, in your inhuman extortions of unjustifiable ruin? Who but the Irish Patriotic Union—the Loyal Minority? And if now they have established a claim to a native Parliament in Dublin by reference to the success of the last, and proved the success of the former experiment beyond the possibility of doubt or cavil, is there anything unreasonable or unnatural in the demand for a restoration of that institution which forms the brightest page in all Irish history? But if it be justifiable to make a demand to manage your own affairs when you have proven that you can attend to them better than other people can do it for you, how much more justifiable and reasonable must their position be, when, after such a demonstration they are contented with so much less than that which we have proven as undoubtedly their due? And what must be the flimsy pretence of those men, who, while professing to be Irishmen from the crown of their head to the sole of their foot, and loving their country while pretending to love their countrymen as their life, yet lose no opportunity of misrepresenting and traducing them both as the vilest and most detestable wretches on the face of the earth?

Well, it may be said that is all very well so far as the past is concerned, but what have we to guide us in the future? Here we have Mr. Smith saying in Mutual Street Rink that, "we have come amongst you, as you have been already told by the Rev. Dr. Kane, at very considerable personal inconvenience and trouble. We have come to Canada to put the truth down the throats of our enemies who have uttered untold calumnies as regards our country. And in assuming that position and taking that stand, we represent there not merely the Protestants of Ulster, or the Protestants of Ireland, but we represent the entire Loyalists of Ireland to whatever creed they belonged and to whatever political party they owed allegiance." What can we say to that, unless we believe the man to be telling a deliberate falsehood? This question, which I have for convenience' sake supposed to come from a third party, seems on the face of it a very delicate one, and to any one not particularly well versed in Irish affairs, not an unreasonable one, which deserves a candid answer. And, although I am of the opinion that I have more than answered it several times over, I will have no objection to repeat the experiment as often as I find that the subject can be illuminated by increased information. There is some

distinguished writer who said that he knew of no way of judging of the future but by the past, and so judging of the future of Ireland by the past, what room is there for reasonable doubt to believe that the interest of the country and the Empire at large would be best promoted by allowing the National Party to govern the country? Doctors, for example, are usually judged by the way in which they treat their patients, and let us suppose, what indeed has been a fact, that Ireland has been in a chronic state, and see how the professional doctors (the landlords or Loyalists) treat the patient, and also how the Nationalist quacks apply themselves to prescribe a remedy for that which they are agreed upon as a desperate case.

Acts introduced by the Nationalists, opposed by the Loyalists, and defeated since 1871 :

BILLS OPPOSED BY ORANGEMEN AND DEFEATED.

- 1871. Landed Property, Ireland, Act, 1847, Amendment Bill.
- 1872. Ulster Tenant Right Bill.
- 1873. Ulster Tenant Right Bill.
- 1873. Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1873. Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, Amendment Bill, No. 2.
- 1874. Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1874. Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, Amendment Bill, No. 2.
- 1874. Ulster Tenant Right Bill.
- 1874. Irish Land Act Extension Bill.
- 1875. Landed Proprietors', Ireland, Bill.
- 1875. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1876. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1876. Tenant Right on Expiration of Leases Bill.
- 1876. Land Tenure, Ireland, Bill.
- 1877. Land Tenure, Ireland, Bill.
- 1877. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1878. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1878. Tenant Right Bill.
- 1878. Tenant Right, Ulster, Bill.
- 1878. Tenants' Improvements, Ireland, Bill.
- 1878. Tenants' Protection, Ireland, Bill.
- 1879. Ulster Tenant Right Bill.
- 1879. Ulster Tenant Right Bill, No. 2.
- 1879. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Bill.
- 1879. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1879. Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill, No. 2.
- 1880. } Landlord and Tenant, Ireland, Act, 1870, Amendment Bill.
- 1880. } 1st session. } Ulster Tenant Right Bill.

ACTS INTRODUCED BY THE GOVERNMENT AT THE INSTIGATION OF THE LOYALISTS, OPOSED VIGOROUSLY BY THE NATIONALISTS, BUT CARRIED BY OVERWHELMING MAJORITIES, SINCE 1830.

- 1830. Importation of Arms Act.
- 1831. Act to Prevent Tumultuous Assemblies, known as the Whiteboy Act.
- 1831. Startey's Arms Act.
- 1832. Importation of Arms and Gunpowder Act.
- 1833. Suspension of Disturbance Act.
- 1833. Change of Venue Act.
- 1834. Disturbance Amendment Continued.
- 1833. Change of Venue Act.
- 1834. Suppression of Disturbances Amendment and Continuance Act.

- 1834. Another Importation of Arms and Gunpowder Act.
- 1835. Public Peace Act.
- 1836. Another Arms Act.
- 1838. Another Arms Act.
- 1839. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1840. Another Arms Act.
- 1841. Outrages Act.
- 1841. Another Arms Act.
- 1843. Another Arms Act.
- 1843. Act Consolidating all Previous Coercion Acts.
- Unlawful Oaths Act.
- Additional Constables near Public Works Act.
- Unlawful Oaths Act.
- Constabulary Force Enlargement Act.
- Crime and Outrage Act.
- Treason Amendment Act.
- Removal of Arms Act.
- 1848. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1848. Another Oaths Act.
- 1849. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1850. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1851. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1853. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1854. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1855. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1856. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1858. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1860. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1862. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1862. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1865. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1866. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act (August).
- 1866. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1867. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1868. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1870. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1871. Protection of Life and Property Act.
- 1871. Peace Preservation Continuance Act.
- 1873. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1875. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1875. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1881. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1882. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1881 to 1886. Arms Act.
- 1880 to 1885. Crimes Act.
- 1886 to 1887. Arms Act.

Now, see what the apostle of truth and gentleness (Mr. Smith) says in the face of the foregoing Acts which he knows all about as well as any member of the House of Commons, and if he does not, he ought to have known this before he came out here to enlighten the people:

"Until the Parnellites told us we were slaves we never knew it. What is the fact? There is no man that breathes upon Irish soil who is not as free in every aspect and respect as every man in England and Scotland. There is no privilege enjoyed in England and Scotland that we have not. There is not an office under the State open to any man in England and Scotland that is not open to every Irishman, and there is never an occasion in which there is competition in England, Ireland and Scotland in

which Irishmen are not able to hold their own. We have more favorable land laws than England or Scotland, we have to pay less taxes to the Imperial exchequer, we have more public money expended amongst us than in England or in Scotland, and so far from being oppressed the balance is all the other way."

If the acts which I have just given are not a damaging and incontrovertible refutation of the assertion contained in that paragraph, I would like to know how, in the midst of so much liberty, it could come to pass that Mr. Parnell was the first man prosecuted by the English Government who was not tried by a packed jury? How, under a system so liberal, men could be apprehended at the will and pleasure of a policeman or magistrate, and kept in prison during their pleasure without trial? And if this is not a system of slavery, will he be good enough to give a definition of what liberty is?—at least such liberty as they enjoy in England and Scotland. If he can find acts corresponding to these in England and Scotland, and show that the juries are packed there the same as they are in Ireland, then he will deserve credit for one fact since he came to instruct us.

Then again, "there is not an office open to any man in England or Scotland that is not open to Irishmen also." Then there is some hope for a "rising barrister of large and increasing practice," according to this, on the old rule, the pleasures of hope should be very sweet. But this empty boast is just as good as the flunkeyism which would have people believe that the poorest subjects can approach the foot of the Throne and make their wants and wishes known to Her Majesty. But let any person in rags and poverty try the experiment, and he will soon discover that it is only an empty, meaningless boast; for if he persevere in his efforts he will be locked up either as a lunatic or something worse; it would be interesting, for instance, to know how many poor people approach Her Majesty in a month or a year; they can, I venture to say, be counted on the fingers of one hand. And so in like manner I would like Mr. Smith to point out in his own province how many Irish—unless those who have proved themselves to be the enemies of their country—how many, outside of such, occupy any position higher than a scavenger? Who fills the Lord Lieutenancy? Who acts as Secretary to Ireland?—all Irishmen, of course.

Mr. Smith boasts that he once offered a subscription to the National League if the gentleman could name a relative of O'Connell's who was not in receipt of a pension. Well, not being a "barrister of large and increasing practice," I have no money to offer as a prize; but Mr. Smith will be giving very important information if he can inform the public how many Englishmen in any Government institution there are in any part of Scotland, or how many Irishmen have Government positions in England, unless the few who have beaten all competitors in such positions as are gained by

competitive examinations during the few years that system has been in vogue. Up to a very recent period the English and Scotch men had the offices in Ireland to themselves, and at present they have a monopoly of all places not in the gift of the people. As to the paying less taxes than England or Scotland, Mr. McGuffin has sufficiently disposed of that by showing that Ireland pays £3,500,000 more than her proper share of Imperial taxation. The next and indeed most startling announcement of our Northern friends is the declaration that they are not opposed to Home Rule, or at least to Local Self-Government, that is, rightly understood. Well, we have had such startling announcements in political circles of of late that our imaginative organs of wonder are getting somewhat blunted, and are probably on that account not in a very receptive attitude to receive or enjoy a good joke. But the assurance that men who opposed every measure for the removal of church and political grievances, who denounced Mr. Butt and his Home Rule resolutions, who used all their influence to exclude Ireland from participation in the franchise, on every occasion when it was extended in England and Scotland; who have helped the landlords in all their confiscations and exterminations, even surpasses in political and clerical athletics anything in the way of somersaults or other gymnastic exercises that Canadian journalists or politicians are capable of making, notwithstanding the great agility which some of them have recently shown. If, however, they are favorable to local self-government, and they cannot approve of a measure that withholds from the proposed Irish legislation the management of the army, navy, police, post office, customs, excise, the power of levying a tariff, and some other restrictions which do not suggest themselves at present, why did they not bring forward an alternative measure showing the amount of liberty they were willing to grant? The fact that they have not done so, coupled with all these agitations against the people leads irresistably to the conclusion that it is not liberty but despotism they would like to establish.

But it is, unfortunately for themselves, though more so for the Catholics in the North of Ireland, no matter of conjecture or speculation what extent of local control they would give the people of Ireland, for their conduct in such matters as they have the management of, shows at once the amount of freedom they wish extended to their countrymen, and shows at what a discount we must receive their declarations of love of country, justice, religious and political liberty. We are told in a book, whose precepts Dr. Kane professes to practice, "That every man shall be judged according to his works," and I presume that if our friends are the representatives of justice and religious liberty, they will lose nothing in the application of this scriptural rule to the conduct of their friends in the North of Ireland, and if on "weighing them in the balance" they are

found much wanting, they had better get some sort of absolution before they presume to talk of their great virtuous and magnanimous ailings with their fellow-men. Let us enquire for a moment into the management of affairs in the Glorious North, where liberty and equality has a meaning not to be misunderstood. If we find the Catholics are liberally treated in this district, when taking the whole province into account, they form a majority of the population, it will at least be one feather in their cap. Probably they will be willing, as they are certainly able to answer the following questions, though, as they may be somewhat embarrassing, I will come to the rescue and answer them for them.

There are more Catholics in proportion in Belfast than there are Protestants in Dublin. Have they had, or have they now, a Catholic member of their Council? Have they now, or have they ever had, a Catholic Mayor, or a Catholic Sheriff, or a Catholic Treasurer, Engineer, or Officer of Health? Have they now, or have they ever had, any Catholic officer whatever, paid or honorary, first-class or lower? Coming from the overwhelmingly Protestant Belfast, in point of numbers and power, how does Derry act, where, though the Catholics are in the majority, the power is in non-Catholic hands? Though there are 17,000 Catholics to 12,000 non-Catholics, there is only one Catholic in the corporation. This corporation does not employ one solitary Catholic in any department. In the workhouse, although 80 per cent. of the inmates are Catholic, not a doctor, not an officer, not a nurse is a Catholic. Coming to the Catholic districts of Donegal, Fermanagh, Tyrone, and Monaghan, there is not now, nor to the knowledge of those who have opportunities of overseeing, has there ever been, one single Catholic appointed to an elective position by the non-Catholic minority who still have power over the Catholic people.

The Catholics in the Dominion sometimes complain of not getting their fair share of representation, but to those who are dissatisfied with things as they are in Canada, I would invite their attention to the picture of tolerance such as it is in the Protestant Ulster, and if they do they must have good reason to thank their lucky stars that the Protestant majority in this country, by whom they are surrounded, are not the slaves of bigotry, selfishness and passion, which unfortunately characterizes the Loyal North. Let us, however, turn our attention from this picture of intolerance and hypocritical show of liberality and justice to one that is as honorable alike to human nature and the religion which they profess, and if it be true that the teachings and tendencies of the Catholic Church are so conservative, degrading and immoral, then I, as an Irishman, feel proud of my countrymen to think that after such a system of persecution as they have endured, they should have shown themselves capable of rising above the petty jealousies and bigoted intolerance as that which they are so erroneously

charged with. The following statements taken from a lecture delivered in Dublin by Mr. Charles Dawson, who is the only Home Ruler I have cited as authority in the course of this article, but as he gives facts that cannot be contradicted, I have made an exception in his case from the rule which I laid down for myself at the outset. The facts herein recorded deserve to be placed in immortelles before the pulpits of Messrs. Dr. Kane and Potts as a lamp of light to guide them in their intolerant darkness. I think it will be seen from this statement that the Irish people have shown themselves worthy of the power which the franchise gave them in 1834 :—

"FORTY-THREE PROTESTANT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT."

Some of these elections are most instructive at the present moment, when revenge and retaliation is predicted of the Irish people. In Dublin City Mr. Ruthven, a Protestant gentleman, was chosen as the colleague of O'Connell; and the son of Mr. Ruthven was elected, as a Protestant gentleman, as the colleague of Mr. Richard More O'Ferrall to represent Kildare. In Kerry County Mr. Mullins, a cousin to Lord Ventry, was returned with the son-in-law of O'Connell. In Kilkenny a Protestant aristocrat, brother of the Earl of Kilkenny, the Hon. Pierce Butler, was chosen; whilst in King's County the Hon. William Parsons, eldest son of the Earl of Ross was elected. For the County of Limerick two Protestant aristocrats were elected, the brother of Lord Clare, and the son and heir of Lord Guiltmore. From Catholic Limerick City went Mr. David Roche, a Protestant (afterwards Sir David), to accompany the Catholic representative, Mr. Wm. Roche. From Mayo went two Protestants, one an aristocrat and cousin to the Marquis of Sligo. Meath sent Mr. Henry Grattan, whose Protestant brothers represented the County of Wicklow. In Queen's County the patriotic father of its present patriotic member was accompanied in the representation of this Catholic county by the Protestant Conservative gentlemen, Sir Charles Henry Coote. From Athlone went Mr. Talbot, the grandson of Lady Talbot de Malahide. Dungarvan sent the Hon. George Lamb, brother of Lord Melbourne, and connected with that Under Secretary "Drummond," who has written his name in the remedial legislation of Ireland. Such were the numbers, such were the classes, the creeds, and politics of the members which Catholic Ireland selected from the "minority handed over, bound hand and foot," to her mercy. In pursuing this question of Parliamentary representation I must be clear on one point. I don't think "toleration" requires that to represent a pure political question, political opponents should be sent. As well ask the supporters of Lord Salisbury to vote for Radicals, or those of Mr. Gladstone to vote for Tories, as to ask the Irish people to send to represent their political views men who would vote directly against them. Many of the instances I have quoted show that at the election of 1834, in their excessive generosity, the Irish people of the three Catholic provinces forget this sound political axiom. With a man's religion, as a candidate for Parliament, we have nothing to do, but with his politics a great deal—the one affects himself, the other affects us, our liberties, and our lives. This overweening fairness of the Irish people, made them slow to learn the lesson and discrimination, and to its very recent appreciation is due the fact that we have not at this moment, as we heartily desire to have, more non-Catholic representative men. In the election of 1848, after the cruel pangs of famine, Catholic constituencies again sent over forty non-Catholic members to Parliament. Amongst them we find, as in the list of 1834, Protestants like Sir Lucius O'Brien and Major M'Namara, for Clare; aristocrats like the Marquis of Kildare, for Kildare County; and Conservatives like Edward Crogan, for Dublin City. At the bye-elections from 1843 to 1868, there were many instances of toleration in the matter of religion and politics, one of the most remarkable occurring in Limerick. Mr. Bill, a Catholic, was rejected, and Mr. James Spaight, a Protestant merchant, was elected by the Catholic people. The moment he coincided with the people on public questions his difference of religion was forgotten. He has often been defeated since, not because of his religion, but because of his strong Conservative views, and his pronounced and unqualified opposition to the political views and aspirations of the people. At the general election of 1868, thirty-three Protestant members were elected by Catholic majorities, amongst

them being again representatives of the upper classes, such as Lord Burke, for Mayo; Lord St. Lawrence, for Galway; and Lord Otho Fitzgerald, for Kildare; and preserving still in a mistaken liberality, such pronounced Conservatives as Colonel Vandeleur for the pre-eminently Catholic County of Clare. Who, then, asked the religion of Chichester Fortescue in Louth? or of Charles White of Tipperary? or Mr. Whitworth of Drogheda? or Jonathan Pim of Dublin? once their political opinions were in harmony with the people's. Then as before, and now as then, the Irish Catholic people asked their representatives no question as to their religion or their class; and even in this very election there are instances where for a representative position they did not even ask their politics. Coming down to 1874, when the political question of Home Rule began to develop, the number of non-Catholics decreased, but every Protestant who adopted the national demand was received with open arms, and twenty-eight non-Catholic members represented Catholic constituencies in the Parliament of 1874. That non-Catholic representation unfolds most interesting incidents, almost all the work and all the glory for Ireland was achieved by the Protestant representatives, to whom the Catholic people had confidently trusted their political liberties. Who were these men? First, there stands out as the great beginning of this closing contest the representative of my native city, the Protestant father of Home Rule, Isaac Butt. William Shaw, the Presbyterian, was elected by the County of Cork, and succeeded to the confidence and leadership of the Irish Catholic people. Joseph Gilles Biggar, then a Protestant, is chosen to be one of that party, of which he has been one of the most useful and the most beloved member. John Martin, the Protestant Presbyterian of the North was re-elected for the County of Meath; and crowning glory of that election, and crowning reward of Catholic confidence in Protestant faith, was the election by the Catholic people of Meath as his successor of our Protestant leader,

CHARLES STEWART PARNELL.

Even under Mr. Parnell's defined and unmistakable political banner of 1880 and 1884 have not non-Catholics been returned everywhere they presented themselves?

MUNICIPAL HONORS.

In 1841, the Catholic Corporations became possessed of political power.* Let me give a few instances of how they have used it in the way of offices of honor. In the City of Galway; at this moment, the Chairman of the Town Commissioners, the Chairman of the Harbor Board, and the Poor-law guardians of the districts are all Protestants. In the City of Waterford, soon after the Municipal Reform Act in 1845, Sir Benjamin Morris was elected Mayor, and again in 1846, 1850, 1852, 1854, 1859, 1862, 1867, 1873, 1879, and in 1884, and 1885, Protestants Mayors were elected in this Catholic city. In

LIMERICK,

at the first election after the Reform Act of 1841, thirteen Protestant members, some of them from the old Corporation, were elected to the new Council. Since that period thirteen non-Catholic Mayors have been elected, including a previous Mayor of the old Corporation, Mr. James Spaight, the Protestant Conservative before alluded to, who was twice elected, and Sir Peter Tait, a Scotch non-Catholic, three times elected, and brother-in-law of the present Protestant representative of the county of Limerick. Since the Corporation has had the power for four years the office has been filled by Protestant gentlemen. In Catholic and, as it has been called "rebel Cork" that toleration and generosity seem to have been unbounded. At the first Reform election nine Protestant gentlemen were named members of Council. The second Mayor of the new Corporation was a Protestant, Mr. Beamish; and then in quick succession followed the Protestant Mayors, Mr. Dowden, Sir John Gordon, Sir John Arnott (now proprietor of the *Irish Times*), and chosen three times Mayor of Catholic Cork. In 1878 Mr. Gregg, a Conservative, was made Mayor, and through this office walked to the lucrative post of Crown-Solicitor for the county. How soon the source of these titles and wealth, the Catholic confidence and toleration is forgotten. As with the office of Mayor so with that of Sheriff. In the very second year the Council named Alderman Hall, a Protestant and Conservative, and when through inferior health he could not serve, they named his son Mr. Robert Hall; and ever since the Sheriffs' list has borne the names of non-Catholic and even Conservative gentlemen. The corporate

representatives on the Harbor Board up to last year contained eight Protestant gentlemen. From the Catholic capital of the south we come to

DUBLIN,

the Catholic capital of the nation. On its assumption of power what did the Catholic Corporation do with the Protestant minority? Did it bind them "hand and foot" in the bonds of persecution? At the first election many non-Catholics were elected as members of Council. The immediate successor of O'Connell as Lord Mayor was the Protestant, George Roe; then there followed Mr. Arabin in the same office, and another was named Mr. Busby, but he could not act. After the Reform of 1849 the Council showed its liberality by electing Mr. B. Lee Guinness, afterwards made a baronet; and following in almost uninterrupted alternation came the following Protestant Chief Magistrates of Dublin, elected almost unanimously by the Catholic majority—Mr. Kinahan, Mr. Boyse, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Atkinson again, Hon. Mr. Vereker, Sir John Barrington, Mr. Wm. Lane Joynt (now Crown and Treasury Solicitor, and formerly Mayor of the Catholic City of Limerick), Mr. Purdon, Mr. Durdon, Mr. Brooks, Sir George Owens, Sir John Barrington, down to my own immediate predecessor in 1881, Alderman Moyers, a Protestant and Conservative gentleman. During the brief time we have had the nomination of sheriffs, many Protestant gentlemen have been placed upon the list; and the Hon. Mr. Vereker, ex-Lord Mayor, filled the office in 1878, and Sir George Owens, a Protestant and Conservative, in 1881, at the very same time that Alderman Moyers, a Protestant and Conservative, was Lord Mayor. But what did you do with the

"OFFICES OF EMOLUMENT?"

Well, here is what we do with them in the town! I have named:—In Galway, the present borough engineer is a Protestant; in Waterford, the city grand jury, tax collector, the poor-rate collector, the solicitors to the Poor-law boards, the dispensary doctors, and the city and county coroners are all non-Catholic; in Limerick, the Clerk of the Union is a Protestant gentleman of the highest position; in Cork, up to a recent period, the present Town Clerk was the only Catholic who held, under the Catholic Corporation, a first-class office; all the rest were Protestants. When, in 1854, the powers of the grand jury and Wide Street Commissioners were transferred to the Corporation, how did it treat the old officers? The Corporation of Cork not only retained the officers whom they could have dismissed on small pensions, but they retained the Secretary of the Grand Jury, who had £111 a year, and they gave him £220, and the Secretary to the Wide Street Commission, who had a salary of £40, was promoted to a position of £100 a year. Even officers who had no legal claim were retained. In addition, a new office was created—that of City Engineer. Two persons competed, the Catholic and Nationalist, Joseph P. Ronayne, afterwards member for the city, and Mr. Benson, Surveyor under the Grand Jury, a Protestant and Conservative. In consideration of his previous claim, the Catholic Corporation selected the Protestant and Conservative instead of the Catholic and Nationalist. Mr. Benson, afterwards knighted, got £600, instead of £150, his previous salary. The City Treasurership being vacant, a Protestant was elected, and, until recently, all the municipal chief offices in Cork, except that of Town Clerk, were held by non-Catholics, and they received £1,840, out of the £2,440 voted by the Catholic Council. In the matter of liberality as to paid offices, Dublin almost rivalled Cork, and stands at this moment unrivalled in its wondrous toleration. The principal paid officers in the old Corporation were in connection with the Water Department. Of these the Corporation took over and retained till his death the Secretary, Sir Drury Jones Dickenson. Mr. Crofton was also retained, a Protestant gentleman—his son was in the corporate service, and his grandson, Mr. Mervyn P. Crofton, a Protestant gentleman, is in their service at this hour. Mr. Curtin, a Protestant gentleman, was Treasurer, and his successor, who now holds this high office, is Mr. Fry, a Protestant gentleman. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Neville, is a Protestant; his assistant, Mr. Harty, is a Protestant; Mr. Andrews, the engineer of the waterworks, is a Protestant; Sir Charles Cameron, the chief officer of health, is a Protestant; and his predecessor, Mr. Boyle, was a Protestant; and Mr. Young, late chief of the sanitary department, is the son of a Presbyterian clergyman, and was supported by Mr. Gray, Alderman Meagher, Alderman Mulligan, and myself for that very office. In fact, out of the total sum of £8,400 per annum paid to chief

officers, £4,000 are paid at the present moment by the Catholic Corporation to non-Catholic gentleman without ever asking their religion or their politics. As to the religion of the lower class clerks, etc., I myself, though many years a member of the Council and twice Lord Mayor, knew nothing whatever, nor did the heads of departments; but I have since ascertained that of all the officials of all classes, twenty-two, or more than one-third, are non-Catholics.

Is there a true Protestant in this city who does not feel his cheeks turn crimson when he compares the intolerant conduct of his co-religionists in the Protestant North, with the Christlike simplicity, the brotherly feeling, and liberality amounting to generosity, on the part of the Catholics in the south, east and west of Ireland. But it may be said in reply, that is all very well, still you cannot expect us to hand over the Government to an ignorant multitude, who have little or no stake in the country. You are aware that the south of Ireland pays nothing like the amount of taxes contributed by the north, which is the most intelligent, wealthy and influential part of the country.

Well, I believe experience has demonstrated that the more the Government of a country is placed in the hands of the people of that country the more upright, honest and capable it will be. As for the educational question, if it does not teach the people to act just and honorable towards one another, then it does not produce the effects for which it is intended, and when we find men who are not supposed to have as good an education nor to be so highly favored by Providence as their neighbors, acting in a manner that commands the admiration of the world, then so much the worse for education, and the religion which these beings profess to preach but practice. It is, after all, a debatable question whether or not the North has the monopoly of education and intelligence and that they claim, and as it is justly observed by some person that when rogues differ honest men get their due.

Dr. Patton, editor of the Dublin Castle organ and Irish correspondent to the London *Times*, writing on the result of the general elections of 1885, says, that in the "recent general election the percentage of spoiled ballots was less in Ireland than in England, Scotland or Wales." And continuing he adds, that "those who suppose that the Ireland of to-day is, as regards illiteracy, the Ireland of sixty years ago, are very much mistaken." Are the Irish people as ignorant to-day as they were fifty years ago? See what *The Toronto Mail*—the organ that has sent its reporters at their heels over the Province—says in an editorial on the second of January:—"One of the secrets of Mr. Parnell's success—perhaps the principal secret of it—is the growth of education, which, as we see, is accompanied by devotion to Nationalist literature; and herein lies one of the greatest difficulties of the Irish question from England's point of view."

Such is the opinion of two of their own supporters. Well, let us see now what amount of taxes these pillars of the state pay in support of the mili-

tary and other extravagant institutions of which they are such idolatrous worshippers:—

The notion that Ulster has a high Schedule D assessment, or a monopoly of it, and is, *par excellence*, the manufacturing province of Ireland, is simply a portion of the Ulster craze. The following table proves this beyond the shadow of a doubt:—

SCHEDULE D.

Counties.	Population 1881.	Amount of Assessment.	Amount per Inhabitant.
Dublin	418,152	£4,479,236	£10 14 4
Antrim	446,647	1,667,308	3 14 8
Waterford	113,183	298,695	2 12 9
Louth	78,228	186,148	2 7 7
Cork	492,810	1,008,228	2 9 11
Limerick	177,203	231,302	1 6 1
Londonderry	164,714	213,058	1 5 11
Kildare	76,102	82,830	1 1 9
King's County	71,867	76,210	1 1 2
Carlow	47,676	50,031	1 0 11
Wexford	123,877	127,315	1 0 7
Dwn	252,409	229,681	0 18 3
Wicklow	73,679	61,726	0 17 7
Kilkenny	98,774	85,709	0 17 4
Queen's County	72,231	56,470	0 15 8
Tipperary	199,056	152,810	0 15 3
Armagh	156,875	117,210	0 14 4
Fermanagh	84,633	49,751	0 11 9
Tyrone	197,233	108,526	0 11 1
Sligo	110,955	53,103	0 9 7
Meath	86,301	39,205	0 9 1
Monaghan	102,590	45,112	0 8 10
Kerry	200,448	74,744	0 7 4
Caven	129,008	47,149	0 7 5
Westmeath	68,303	23,455	0 6 10
Lough	60,790	20,130	0 6 7
Clare	141,210	45,782	0 6 6
Galway	241,662	78,624	0 6 6
Rosecommon	134,965	38,131	0 5 8
Mayo	243,030	59,356	0 4 10
Donegal	205,443	49,549	0 4 9
Leitrim	89,795	19,874	0 4 5

The above scale is prepared from the identical return from which Mr. Goschen's figures were taken—namely 149 of Session 1882—when opposing the Home Rule Bill. Now if Ulster is on the whole a manufacturing and trading province, or even if it is so to an extent, the rest of Ireland is not, how is it to be accounted for that six Ulster counties out of the nine are amongst the lowest sixteen names in the above list, and only three of them in the highest? How is it that amongst the first half-dozen names there is only one Ulster county? If Leinster is more agricultural than Ulster, and less manufacturing and trading, how is it to be accounted for that nine of its twelve counties are amongst the highest sixteen names, whereas Ulster has only three, even Munster having four out of six?

That Ulster is wholly unfit to hold a candle to Leinster, so far as Schedule D assessments are concerned, and that Ulster's superiority in this respect over Munster is exceedingly trifling, is evident from the following table prepared from the return already mentioned:—

	Population 1881.	Schedule D Assessment.	Ass'tment per Inhabitant.
Leinster	1,282,881	£5,291,461	£4 2 6
Ulster	1,789,542	2,527,344	1 9 1
Munster	1,323,910	1,811,343	1 7 4
Connaught	813,506	249,088	0 6 1

It will be observed that although Leinster—the really prosperous and Imperial province—is far and away ahead of the northern imposter, the latter is *not* far and away ahead of Munster. As between Leinster and Ulster it may be urged that Dublin City accounts for Leinster's superiority, and that otherwise Ulster is considerably ahead of it, so far, at all events, as Schedule D is concerned. I append herewith a tabular statement showing the respective positions of Leinster, Ulster and Munster—Dublin being left out of Leinster, Belfast out of Ulster, and Cork out of Munster:—

	Population 1881.	Schedule D per Assessment.	Ass'm't per Inhabitant.
Leinster (minus Dublin).....	1,009,817	£995,493	£0 19 9
Munster (minus Cork).....	1,226,384	1,043,906	0 17 3
Ulster (minus Belfast).....	1,536,871	1,063,376	0 13 10

The above comparison is not quite fair to Leinster; Dublin being a much larger proportion, of its population, and especially of its *urban* population than Belfast is of that of Ulster; yet observe the result! Ulster, the imaginary manufacturing and industrial province, is not merely hopelessly behind Leinster, but considerably so behind Munster. With Dublin left out of Leinster and Belfast out of Ulster the population of the latter is more than half as much as the population of the former. Yet its Schedule D assessment is only some £68,000 more. Similarly when compared with Munster the so-called Imperial province has an extra population of over 300,000, but an extra Schedule D assessment of only £19,470. With Dublin and Belfast both included Leinster's Schedule D assessment is, as we have seen, £4 2s 6d per inhabitant; and Ulster £1 9s 1d. With Dublin and Belfast left out the figures are—Leinster, 19s 9d; and Ulster, 13s 10d. As regards Ulster and Munster, the broad facts as to Schedule D are, that with Belfast and Cork included Ulster is only £1 9s 1d per inhabitant to Munster's £1 7s 4d; and that with Belfast and Cork left out the figures are—Ulster, 13s 10d; and Munster—modest, unassuming agricultural Munster—17s 3d; and now I suppose it is about time to ask whether a more outrageous and unfounded figment was ever exploded—a more hideous imposture ever unmasked—than this pretension as to Ulster's superiority in the matter of trade, manufactures, and commerce over Leinster and over Munster."

Now, the income tax is another indication of the comparative prosperity of one country with another, or part of a country with the remainder of it:

The income tax assessment in Leinster was £10 6s 9d per head: in Munster and Ulster, £6 0s 7d, and £5 14s 5d; and in Connaught, £3 13s 7d. The member for the Hawick Burghs obtained a return of the valuation of the rateable property in the Irish constituencies, and from this it appears that Leinster stands valued at the rate of £3 13s 5d; Munster, £2 10s 10d; Ulster, £2 9s 11d; and Connaught, £1 15s 2d. It is constantly dinned into our ears that Ulster is wealthy and prosperous, and that we represent the impoverished provinces, and want to seize upon Ulster because she is prosperous. But, as a matter of fact, so far as rateable value is concerned, only one of the four provinces stands lower than Ulster, and that is Connaught; the others are all higher. In neither the assessment for income tax nor in the valuation for rateable property does any Ulster County stand amongst the first fourteen.

I now proceed to show that Ulster is not merely an agricultural province, but that it is to an enormously greater extent than Leinster, and slightly more so even than Munster, being only exceeded in this respect by Connaught. If I show at the same time that its agricultural population is much poorer than that of Leinster or Munster, the comparative poverty of Ulster, except as compared with Connaught, will be largely accounted for.

In the following table the population of each province is divided into those who are engaged in or supported by agriculture as distinguished from those persons who are connected with other pursuits:—

	Agricultural.	Non-Agricultural.
Ulster	1,180,062	563,013
Munster	883,860	447,155
Connaught	720,593	101,064
Leinster	649,726	629,203

It will be observed that Leinster has a smaller agricultural population than any other province, and that its non-agricultural population greatly exceeds that of Munster, and is actually greater than that of Ulster, notwithstanding the latter's superiority in point of size. The following table shows the proportion per cent. of the agricultural population in each of the four provinces :—

	<i>Per cent.</i>
Connaught.....	87.7
Ulster.....	67.7
Munster.....	66.4
Leinster.....	50.8

Having ascertained that Ulster is an agricultural province, of whose inhabitants about 68 per cent. are dependent upon agriculture, it remains to investigate the comparative position of the agricultural population of the four provinces. Seeing that Ulster is so very largely agricultural, it is impossible that the province can be comparatively poor unless its agricultural population is poor. Whether this is so or not will very speedily appear.

The following table shows the value of cereals and other crops, together with the value of the cattle, sheep and pigs, at the estimated prices obtained from Thom's Almanac, and published in the current volume :—

	<i>Cereals and other Crops.</i>	<i>Cattle, Sheep, and Pigs.</i>
Leinster.....	£8,092,030	£16,938,867
Munster.....	7,651,243	20,048,949
Ulster.....	11,623,757	14,667,364
Connaught.....	4,406,903	10,857,097

Of this total amount, the question of course is what population belongs to each province per head of its agricultural population? The following table supplies the answer :—

	<i>Total Value of Crops and Live Stock.</i>	<i>Amount per Agricultural Inhabitant.</i>
Leinster.....	£25,030,897	£38 10 6
Munster.....	27,700,192	31 6 8
Ulster.....	27,291,121	25 2 7
Connaught.....	15,264,000	18 11 6

The agricultural population of Ulster is thus shown to be miserably poor, not merely in comparison with that of Leinster, but with that of Munster likewise. Its agricultural superiority to Connaught is not greater than its own inferiority to Munster. Although there are 1,180,062 persons in Ulster directly connected with agriculture, and only 883,860 such persons in Munster, the latter possesses a greater amount of agricultural wealth. Leinster has little more than half the agricultural population of Ulster, yet has an almost equal amount of agricultural wealth—namely twenty-five million pounds' worth to Ulster's twenty-seven and a quarter million pounds' worth.

It cannot but be a revelation, and I fear not a very agreeable one to Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith, to find that even here the people know a little about Ulster, and possibly it is as well for them that they did know something before, or they might be permitted to remain in their ignorance on such questions if they had to depend on these apostles of truth from the North. Now, let us see what they have done, of whom we have seen such a liberal amount of slanderous and cowardly abuse. They got, in the first place, the Land Act in the teeth of the Loyal Minority, and according to Mr. Smith, the people would never have known they were in need

of such a measure had Mr. Parnell and his followers but let them alone. So that the agitators were the first to discover that the tenants were paying from 25 to 50 per cent. more rent than justice demanded, or than their land could produce. The gentlemen in the following list, who opposed the Land Act as they now oppose Home Rule, on the ground that the tenants were not paying as much as tenants in other parts of the country, will give some indication of the wholesale robbery perpetrated on the people of Ireland before the agitators took up their cause.

Before the Land Act passed Irish landlords insisted that they were only charging fair rents for their land. The following are the percentages of reductions made by the Land Courts upon the estates of peers holding land in Ireland :—

<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Earl of Charlemont	Earl of Norbury.....16.8
Lord Lurgan.....24.7	Earl of Bantry.....19.6
Duke of Manchester.....26.5	Duke of Devonshire.....15.0
Earl Annesly.....21.5	Earl of Egmont.....20.0
Marquis Conyngham.....17.2	Earl of Kenmare.....12.5
Earl of Leitrim.....30.0	Viscount Lismore.....20.6
Viscount Lifford.....23.8	Viscount Middleton.....18.0
Lord Templemore.....21.4	Marquis of Lansdowne.....17.0
Viscount Bangor.....11.0	Lord Ventry.....14.8
Earl of Dufferin.....27.2	Lord Leconfield.....18.0
Earl of Kilmorey.....10.5	Lord Maasy.....17.1
Marquis of Londonderry.....17.4	Viscount Southwell.....22.4
Marquis of Ely.....21.5	Earl of Donoughmore.....16.3
Earl of Enniskillen.....10.0	Viscount Hawarden.....17.0
Marquis of Headfort.....21.8	Lord Normanton.....16.7
Lord Holland.....22.0	Earl of Ockney.....18.0
Lord Massereene.....19.2	Lord Muskerry.....14.8
Earl Russell.....30.0	Earl of Portarlington.....10.0
Lord Ashbrook.....41.4	Earl of Ross.....20.7
Lord Castletown.....19.4	Lord Waterford.....16.8
Viscount Gough.....26.0	Lord Ashdown.....20.5
Marquis of Sligo.....18.0	Earl of Huntingdon.....24.7
Lord Greville.....19.5	Earl Fortescue.....15.0
Lord Carew.....11.0	Viscount Doneraile.....18.6
Earl of Courtown.....11.4	Duke of St. Albans.....23.0
Earl of Carysfort.....15.0	Earl of Bessborough.....25.0
Lord Ardilaun.....20.0	Marquis of Downshire.....22.0
Earl of Clancarty.....10.3	Marquis of Drogheda.....12.5
Marquis of Clanricarde.....14.6	Duke of Leinster.....17.7
Lord Montmorres.....40.4	Viscount Montgarret.....12.7
Lord Wallscourt.....22.0	Lord Digby.....10.3
Earl of Albemarle.....21.3	Earl of Granard.....35.5
Lord Horlech.....19.7	Lord Bellew.....16.7
Marquis of Bath.....16.0	Earl of Darnley.....11.4
Lord Rathdonnell.....16.0	Viscount Gormanstown.....26.0
Viscount Templeton.....11.2	Earl of Arran.....18.0
Duke of Abercorn.....12.0	Lord De Clifford.....11.6
Lord Inchiquin.....15.4	Earl of Lucan.....19.3

Here, then, we have the decision of a legal tribunal that the peers holding land in Ireland have almost without an exception been charging their unfortunate tenants unfair rents, and as if to add injury to insult all these gentlemen are members or supporters of the Loyal and Patriotic

Union, of which Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith seem to be the paid agents. But there is another case that was recently brought before the notice of the house by the gallant Mayor Saunderson, who seems to have more compassion with the landlord, Captain Hill, than with the poor tenants, who seem to have been fleeced most unmercifully by this gallant member of the Jingo Club. Captain Hill's tenants threatened to take him into the Land Courts if he did not consent to give them a reasonable reduction in their rent ; but instead of complying or even considering their application, he gave them to understand that if they did so he would saddle them with the costs of an appeal ; but being assisted by that disloyal organization, the National League, they went into the court with a result that astonished everybody but themselves by getting a reduction of 37 per cent. The gallant captain was as good as his word in taking the case before the Chief Commissioners, who to his great surprise and indignation, confirmed the decision of the lower court and saddled the costs upon himself. Let me, in passing, enquire of Mr. Smith if he has any of the writs of Captain Hill, of the County of Donegal, in his possession, and if so, they might be worth ornamenting with a mahogany frame. There are other ways in which the Leaguers do a service to the country, for which they get no credit for. One of the principal parts of the business at all their meetings is to consider applications for relief from evicted tenants. I have just found a few reports of these meetings, not consecutive, as it was not anticipated that they would ever be used, so they are not picked out for the occasion, but such as they are, will show the nature of the work in which the agitators are engaged, compared with that of the reverend and learned gentlemen who are here representing the company of evictors. On the 18th of March, 1886, the following was disposed of:—

Mrs. Moroney's Miltown-Malbay evicted tenants, grant £15; Dean Keating's Urlingford evicted tenants, grant, £20; Rafter's Ballyroan evicted tenants, grant, £12; Loughrey's Clonmanny evicted tenants, grant, £14. Landlord, Earl of Kenmare, tenant, Thomas Fleming, rent, £27; valuation £18; grant £2. Landlord, Viscount Gillamore; tenant, William O'Donovan; rent £187 11s 6d; valuation, £149 6s; grant £4. Keathing's Lagginstown evicted tenants, grant, £6. Landlord, Dean Massy; tenant, John O'Neil; grant, £3. Landlord, James Myers; tenant, William Toblin; grant, £3. Landlord, William N. Barrow; tenant, M. Coffey; rent £78; valuation, £55; grant, £2. Landlord, Lady Jones; tenant, J. Gormley; rent, £3 15s; valuation, £2. Landlord, John Madden; tenants, Daniel Maguire; rent, £8 15s; valuation, £8; John Keegan; rent, £4; valuation, £3; grant, £5. Landlord, J. J. Bodkin; tenant, John Keane; rent, £9 10; valuation, £5; grant, £2. Landlord, Dwane Smythe; tenant, Daniel M'Auliffe; rent, £29 8s 1d; valuation, £22; grant, £3. Landlord, Mrs. S. Holmes; tenant, Richard Connolly; rent, £105 10s; valuation, £55; grant, £2. Landlord, Col. Cooper; tenant, Patrick Kennedy; rent, £75; valuation, £60; grant, £4. Landlord, Dixon O'Keffe; tenant Patrick Ryan; rent, £78 1s 10d; valuation, £36 18s; grant, £4. Landlord, Mrs. Bland; tenant, John M'Mahon; rent, £36 10d; valuation, £18 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, Mr. Gradwell; tenant, Mrs. Mary Hand; rent, £24 12s 4d; valuation,

£17 5s; grant, £2. Landlord, Richard Cheevers; tenant, Mrs. Catherine Cole; £2. Landlord, Rev. E. Denny; tenant, Catherine Slattery; rent, £60; valuation, £35; grant, £3. Landlord, Matthew Purcell; tenant, Edward Hayes; rent, £52; valuation, £29 5s; grant, £3. Landlord, Richard Burke; tenant, John Dwyer; rent, £230; valuation, £100; grant, £3. Landlord, Nathaniel Buckley; tenant, Benjamin Martin; rent, £90; valuation, £37 10; grant, £3. Landlord, Abraham Murphy; tenant, D. Leary; rent, £32; valuation, £15 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, James O'Connell; tenant, Mary Horgan; rent, £24 10s; valuation, £13 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, Lord Clinton; tenant, Timothy Sullivan; rent, £5; valuation, £3 9s; grant, £2. Landlord, Henry Beasley; tenant, Mrs. Meagher; grant, £4. Landlord, Lord Ventry; tenant, Daniel Murphy; rent, £10 10s; valuation, £6 15; grant, £3. Landlord, Captain Magill; tenant, Thos. Boyle; rent, £34; valuation, £25; grant, £3. Total amounts of grants voted, £136.

Applications for evicted tenants were next considered, and grants voted in the following cases:—Landlord, R. John M'Geough; tenant, James Devlin; grant, £3; Landlord, Major Leslie; tenant, John Franklin; rent £26 2s 6d; valuation, £16 10s, grant £3; Wrafters Ballyroan evicted tenants, usual grant, £12. Landlord, Earl of Kenmare tenants, C. Murphy; grant, £2; M. Maynahan, grant, £2; John Moriarty; grant, £2; Patrick Sullivan, grant, £3; James Sullivan, grant, £3; James Flynn, grant, £3; Landlord, Robert Fitzgerald; tenant, D. Foley; rent, £16 10; valuation, £26 5s; grant, £3. Landlord, Rev. J. Cooke; tenant, James Cuthbert; rent, £60; valuation, £31 5s; grant, £2. Landlord, Captain Hugh Humphreys; tenant, W. Tyndle; rent, £67 10s; valuation, £34; grant, £3. Landlord, J. Kiely, tenant, Mary Martin; rent, £123 5s; valuation, £117 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, Mr. Denton; tenant, James Byrne; grant, £3. Landlord, John Leader; tenant, Mrs. Nagle; rent, £120 5s; valuation, £84; grant, £3. Landlord, Marquis of Ormond; tenant, James Fribbs; grant, £3. Landlord, F. C. Bland; tenant, John Burns; rent, £5 15s; valuation, £1 19s; grant, £2. Landlord, R. H. Johnston; tenant, Mullanaphy; rent, £11 5s; valuation, £6; grant, £3. Landlord, Norah Harding; tenant, D. Gleeson; rent, £45; valuation, £18 15; grant, £3. Landlord, Lord Kenmare; tenant, D. Crowley; rent, £87; valuation, £26 10s; grant, £4. Landlord, Captain Hussey; tenant, Michael M'Donnell; rent, £55; valuation, £17; grant, £3. Landlord, C. W. Smyth; tenant, D. Gorman; rent, £64; valuation, £27; grant, £3. Landlord, Richard Stackpoole; tenant, Patrick Galley; grant, £2; Carowmeenagh evicted tenants, grant, £20; Daniel M'Carthy, evicted tenant; grant, £3. Landlord, Captain Douglas; tenant, Patrick M'Kenaa; grant, £2. Landlord, Jonathan Bruce; tenant, Patrick Sheehy; grant, £3; Landlord, Chas. Lynch; tenant, P. Garvey; grant, £2. Landlord, Colonel King-Harman; tenant, James Sheridan; grant, £2; Mrs. Quirke, evicted tenant; grant, £3; James O'Brien, evicted tenant, grant, £3. Landlord, C. Brady; tenants, Mrs. Byrne and Michael Brannigan; grant, £4. Landlord, the Governor-General of Canada; tenant, Martin Shea; rent, £18 10s; valuation, £10 9s; grant, £2. Landlord, the Earl of Kenmare; tenant, Mary M'Grath; rent, £45; valuation, £35; grant, £3; Landlord, Lord Ventry; tenant, Mr. Michael Murphy; grant, £2. Landlord, A. Tuit; tenant, James Lombard; rent, £28; valuation, £14; grant, £3. Landlord, Captain Magill; tenant, W. Boyle; rent, £17; valuation, £12 10; grant, £2. Landlord, J. B. Blennensasset; tenant, Patrick Mullano; rent, £26; valuation, £17 15s; grant, £3. Landlord, Adam Perry; tenants, James Clery and Patrick Hickey; grants, £6; Major Lester's Passas-Green evicted tenants; grants, £16.

Thos. Dowling's Cappawhite evicted tenants; grant, £20. Total grants to evicted tenants—£171.

Applications on behalf of evicted tenants were next considered, and grants voted in the following cases :—Major Creagh's Cloughleigh evicted tenants; grant, £50; Lord Clancurry's Murroe evicted tenants; grant, £184 10s. Lord De Vesel's Abbeyleix evicted tenants; grant, £15 10d. Surgeon O'Grady's Abbeyfeal evicted tenants; grant, £20. Philip Percival's and W. R. Jones' Clonoulty evicted tenants; grant, £12. Landlord, Colonel Davis; tenant, Bridget Hanley; rent, £6 13s 8d; valuation, £5 15s; grant, £2. Boholo evicted tenants, County Mayo; grant, £10. Landlords, Governors of Erasmus Smith's Schools; tenant, James Conway; rent, £6 15s 6d; valuation, £8; grant, £2. Landlord, R. W. Aitkins; tenant, James Cadigan; rent, £85; valuation £67; grant, £3. Landlord, Rev. E. Denny; tenant, Patrick English; rent, £175; valuation, £114; grant, £3. Landlord, Colonel King-Harman; tenant, John Fagan; rent, £17 12s 6d; valuation, £12 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, Charles Barton; tenant, Anne M'Gowen; grant, £2. Landlord, P. S. French; tenant, F. O'Callaghan; rent, £70; valuation, £47 5s; grant, £2. Landlord, Mrs. Lowry; tenant, John Slevin; rent, £20; valuation, \$10; grant, £3. Landlord, P. B. G. Daly; tenant, Michael Flattery; rent; £38; valuation, £24; grant, £3. Landlord, Sir E. D. Burrowes; tenant, Martin Farrell; rent, £120; valuation, £66; grant, £2. Landlord, the Marquis of Waterford; tenant, James Cullen; grant, £2. Landlord, the Earl of Kenmare; tenant, Thomas Leary; grant, £2. Landlord, John R. Leahy; tenant, Thomas Sullivan; rent, £105; valuation, £52; grant, £3. Landlord, Mrs. Bruce; tenant, Cornelius Dore; rent, £60; valuation, £39 10s; grant, £2. Landlord, Rev. W. Gubbins; tenant, Patrick Ryan; rent, £75 8s 2d; valuation, £57; grant, £3. Landlords, Governors Erasmus Smith Schools, tenant, Timothy Burke; rent, £53 6s 8d; valuation, £43 15s; grant, £3. Landlord, Colonel John O'Callaghan; tenant, Mary Cooney; rent, £16; valuation, £9 15s; Michael Hynes; rent, £34 10s; valuation, £24; grant, £4. Landlord, the Marquis of Waterford; tenant, Thomas Byrne; rent, £22 10s; valuation, £20; grant, £3. Landlord, Sir H. P. F. Barron; tenant, John O'Callaghan; rent, £185; valuation, £117 5s; grant, £4. Landlord S. Gubbins; tenant, Patrick Cosgrave; rent, £4 10s; valuation, £2 11s; grant, £2. Landlord Patrick D. Fynes; rent, £11 10s 8d; valuation, £3; grant, £2. Landlord, Mrs. Atkison; tenant, John Scanlon; rent, £20; valuation, £9 15s; grant, £3. Landlord, Court of Bankruptcy; tenant, J. Doorish; rent, £17 8s; valuation, £11; grant, £2. Landlord, Lord C. Clinton; agent, Henry Wright, solicitor; tenant, Michael Murphy; rent, £40 5s; valuation, £23 15s; grant, £3. Total grants, £354.

Having now given a slight indication of the manner in which the National League persecutes tenants whom the landlords are continually evicting in Ireland; having shown by the numerous acts, that the national party have introduced in Parliament, and carried to a successful issue in the face of the bitter opposition of those Loyalists who profess themselves such sincere friends of their country; having pointed out the universal reductions in rents through the operation of the Land Act, in face of the fact that over 600,000 tenants were excluded from its operation; having shown the liberal and just spirit in which the Catholics have treated

their Protestant countrymen in the south of Ireland, and forgetting for the present several other important considerations, such as the rebellions and insurrections which I have traced to the combined action of the loyal minority, the exposure of the criminal charge that was patched up by the loyal delegates against Mr. Egan, and how grossly absurd was the interested assertion of Ireland's great prosperity since the union, I may be permitted to observe that, while I have proven every statement which I have made by facts and figures, and by citing authorities which the whole army of Loyalists must submit to in silence, there was not one assertion made in Mutual Street Rink which was sustained by one single fact or authority, notwithstanding that Mr. Smith had his trunk filled with damaging documents which, as a barrister, he knew would be essential to his cause, and as he did not show much regard for justice or the feelings of others by the foolhardy statements he made, we are justified in believing that they have no facts to produce in support of their assertions; and that they are destitute of anything to sustain their charges and assertions is made more conclusive by the rehash they have given of the Toronto speeches at all the other meetings they have since addressed. The only variation observable in their proceedings, is a change from the bold and unscrupulous assertions which though reckless, had a certain amount of candor about them that contrasted favorably with the cunning manner in which they try to protect themselves from the logical result of the former charges without having to acknowledge manfully that they were wrong, and saying honestly, *which would indeed be true*, that they were sorry the Canadian people are not so ignorant of Irish affairs as they expected and hoped to find them.

But, as judging from the tone of all their speeches, they are in reality the only true friends of a country, which like the parents of other unworthy prodigals, must sorrowfully acknowledge their claim of an unworthy kinship. Perhaps they will now be in a position to inform the Canadian or American people what they have done for the land of their birth, and the people whose happiness it was their duty to promote. If they have done any thing in the interest of their countrymen, other than opposing all attempts at reforming the land laws, their futile efforts to defeat the disestablishment of a grasping and monopolizing alien church, the assisting of absentee landlords to evict their own countrymen, and in many instances co-religionists, and, in short, their unwavering and persistent opposition to every measure which experience has proven to be indispensably necessary for the general welfare and prosperity of the people throughout the country.

Any little act of kindness that they have done either individually or collectively for the benefit of their countrymen, they will be doing their cause no small service if they will only state it with such proofs or reasonable circumstances as will justify us in believing it. But in the absence of

such information, Irishmen must beg to be excused if they do not recognize them as their friends and benefactors, or as part and parcel of the same common race, for it is as much of a truism to-day as it was in the days of Homer, that,

"A generous friendship no cold medium knows,
Burns with one love, with one resentment glows;
One should our interests and our passions be;
My friend must hate the man that injures."

And as I have sufficiently proven that the interest of the Loyal Minority or Patriotic Union, and the interest of the Irish people, are as different and as widely separated as the poles asunder, it is anything but unreasonable to find that there is no love lost between us.

THE PARNELL ESTATE.

There is, however, one matter to which I must refer before closing, although I was in hope that Mr. Ryan's letter to the Rev. Dr. Kane and Mr. Smith would have brought out such an acknowledgement of the imposition practiced on the supposed ignorance of their audience, and such an apology for the same as would render any further reference to the matter no longer necessary; yet, seeing that Messrs. Kane and Smith are trying to make it appear in their later effusions that it was to Mr. Howard Parnell's property they referred to, when speaking in Toronto, I will reproduce that paragraph in Mr. Smith's address, in which he speaks of the Parnell tenants not getting the benefit of such legislation as Mr. Parnell demanded.

Now, look at the question from another point of view. Mr. Parnell says, "I and my party thoroughly and honestly believe that the curse and ruination has been caused by landlordism, and Ireland will never be peaceable and happy until the landlords are expropriated out of the country, and until the occupiers of the soil are the owners of the soil. If a man came to you and asked you for a subscription to some charity, it would be natural for you to ask him how much he had given towards it. When he says, 'Oh, I don't subscribe anything, I merely declare its benefits to other people,' you feel justified in refusing him. That in vulgar Canadian language is called judging a man by his action. Judge Mr. Parnell by his action. Doctrine No. 1—We landlords must be expropriated. Then why in the name of goodness doesn't he expropriate himself? Why then in the name of goodness did he not make his own tenants freeholders? But he had never made an effort to meet them on their own terms, and the conditions he exacted were that if the rents due in September were not paid by the end of October they would be served with a document called a writ. This cannot be contradicted. I have seen dozens of writs on the Parnell property served last October for the rents due on the 29th September. If one of the landlords of Ulster attempted to do anything of this kind the *Freeman's Journal* would be enlarged ten-fold, and the press agency would carry on the wings of the telegraph wire to Toronto and elsewhere news of the persecutions of the Irish landlords."

Now who, I would like to know, would recognize in the above cutting that I have given from the *Mail*, any allusion to Mr. H. Parnell, the

peach grower in the Western States, or that Mr. C. Stewart Parnell was managing any other estate than his own. Samuel Weller is said to have complained of his power of vision, because he was unable to see through a flight of stairs and a stone-wall. But it would require an intellect the most subtle and powerful that ever was given to man to discover in this particular portion of Mr. Smith's speech that there was any other Parnell in existence than the gentlemen who thoroughly and honestly believe that the curse and ruination of Ireland had been brought about by landlordism. And it is too late in the day to say that it was Mr. Howard Parnell they had in view when they referred to the Parnell estate, and the number of the documents called writs, which Mr. Smith had in his trunk with regard to that property. Who would suppose for one moment, from the speech, that Mr. C. Parnell was acting as agent for his brother in the County Armagh. No person, not even the Orange school inspector of Toronto, who, if he has not got an eye has at least got a nose that can smell popery in the distance, and ought, therefore, to be the most likely to see that it was not Mr. C. S. Parnell that Mr. Smith had in view.

However, lest they should change their spots again, like the leopard, I may state for the information of all whom it may concern, that though Mr. H. Parnell is one of the largest peach growers in the Western States, and cannot of necessity manage his own property as well as if he was at home, yet his brother, Mr. C. Stewart Parnell does not manage it for him, nor has not done so since he succeeded Mr. Shaw as leader of the Irish party. That some years ago Mr. Howard Parnell rented his property to a middleman at thirty shillings per acre, with the power of sub-letting, and of which this gentlemen, who, no doubt belongs to the Loyal and Patriotic Union, took advantage of the clause in his favor by sub-letting the land that only cost him thirty shillings for fifty shillings, to men whom he knew could not possibly pay it. This disinterested friend of his country, finding that he had made a serious miscalculation, that the annual contributions sent to the tenants by their Americans and colonial friends for the payment of rents which the land could not produce, should be devoted as usual to the *laudable objects of paying rack rent* instead of the more base and criminal use to which it has latterly been put, namely, preserving the home and family of the tenants from extortion and starvation, which the increased intelligence and confidence acquired by the tenant farmers through the influence of the agitators and the National League, has taught them to be a better way of using the hard savings of their friends than keeping absentee landlords and middlemen up in luxury. This particular gentleman for the enforcement of whose rights, and the preservation of whose interest, among others, the Loyal and Patriotic Union was formed, finding that he could no longer rely upon the savings of other people for the payment of his rent,

set about evicting the tenants, and as a consequence the owner of the estate receives all the blame, although he is only partly responsible. But so far from this being a reflection on Mr. Parnell's conduct, it is, I contend, a justification of his action on the land question from the beginning, as it proves what he has been contending for all along the line of his warfare against absentee landlords, that they cannot manage their estates properly, nor take such interest in the welfare of their tenantry as should, and would be more likely to take if they were living on the property. But even if Mr. Howard Parnell had the antiquated notions of property peculiar to the old slaveholders among whom he lives, that would be no reason why his brother should be held responsible for his actions, as it is not so very uncommon to see Radicals and Tories in the same family, and therefore the one acting in direct opposition to the wishes of the other.

of the
a. But
ontend,
ing, as
warfare
operly,
would
if Mr.
he old
hy his
o very
erefore